

THE
THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM.

JANUARY, 1876.

ART. I.—*Sources and Sketches of Cumberland Presbyterian History.*—No. IV.

THE REVIVALIST: AUGUST, 1832; JULY 23, 1834. TWO VOLUMES.

THIS is a sheet, sixteen by twenty-one inches, six columns; in burgeois type. The heading is very plain, merely the name, and a second line giving location and date. No. 4 is of August 30, 1832. No. 5, Vol. II., September 4, 1833, is made up in five columns. In the following number a line is interposed between title and date—"A Family Paper, Devoted to Religion, Benevolence, and General Intelligence." Price \$2.00 per annum, in advance; \$2.50 in six months; \$3.00 at the end of the year. In selections, the excellent taste and judgement which characterized its predecessor is still exhibited. The amount of editorial writing is increased, being ordinarily two columns or more in each number. The revival news is not quite so full as in the *Intelligencer*. The contributors are somewhat more numerous and active. The principal are "B." (Beard); an interesting series of sixteen letters from Mississippi; Theophilus, A Layman, Pastor, A Looker Into, and Philalethes, who discuss ministerial education, and other topics of general interest. "Cumberland" gives a series of valuable communications, "Letters from the South," on various practical topics. There are fifty and more communications from as many writers on colleges, theological schools, and evangelical subjects. Very little

VOL. VII. NO. I.—1



controversy. On the other hand, the editor, James Smith, seems to have been ready enough to wield the polemic's pen in defending his Church against misrepresentations, in denouncing evil practices, and in correcting eastern ignorance of the west. The two volumes of the *Revivalist* also contain extensive selections bearing upon the early history of our Church, the editor looking forward to embodying this material in a book.

Dr. Beard's files want Nos. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 33, of Vol. I., and Nos. 1, 4, 52, of Vol. II.

September 27, 1832. In a letter from Rev. James Smith, under date New Hope, Tenn., Sept. 20, 1832, giving an account of the camp-meeting just closed at Lebanon, occurs the following singular narrative and conversion: "A Mr. ——, who, for a number of years has been a pest to all the camp-meetings in the country—has been long in the habit of attending them for the purpose of making money by barbecues and selling whiskey—has often been tried in court and fined for his proceedings. But notwithstanding all the exertions that were used to deter him, he still persevered, to the great annoyance of our Methodist brethren particularly; and his conduct will excite the less astonishment, when I inform you that he states that at camp-meeting occasions he has sometimes realized one hundred and forty dollars. He came to the meeting at Lebanon, no doubt elated with the expectation of realizing a very handsome profit from his strange business. He dug his pit, roasted his pigs, and spread his table; but alas! for once, the poor man was disappointed. For although the assembly was very large, such was the liberality of the gentlemen who encamped, that his customers were very few, and to his sorrow he found himself engaged in a sinking concern. On Tuesday evening he ventured to take a seat on the outskirts of the congregation, an arrow of conviction pierced his heart, he fell prostrate before the throne of grace, he cried for mercy, obtained pardon, and that night he was employed in exhorting his wicked companions to flee the wrath to come. He appeared to be a true penitent, and to enjoy the light of God's countenance. He is now a member of the Church,

and a warm temperance man. He has a large distillery, but he says he will not make another drop of the poison."

Nov. 8, 1832. Rev. J. L. Dillard, writing from Rome, Tenn., Oct. 27, thus describes a remarkable camp-meeting: "Another camp-meeting was held at Providence, Wilson county. This commenced on Friday, before the second Sabbath in the present month. A general expectation seemed to prevail among Christians, and even the unconverted, that some important results would be realized at this meeting. The incessant showers of rain, however, during the first two days and nights, seemed to fall with a blighting influence upon our fair prospects. Some few of the camp-holders moved to the ground through the rain on Friday; some, when it held up on Saturday night, though it was very dark; some on Sabbath morning, whilst others were prevented altogether. On Sabbath morning, however, the sun rose clear, and throwing his lovely beams over our dejected encampment, seemed to bid declining hope return to our bosoms. About eleven o'clock we had a considerable congregation. Divine service commenced. The servants of God, in showing the way of salvation, appeared to be in the spirit. A general solemnity prevailed, whilst a number distinguished themselves as candidates for mercy, by falling prostrate before the Lord. From this time till Monday evening, people living at a distance were coming in. The excitement was considerable on Sabbath; but gradually and steadily prevailed, more and more, until Monday night. Tuesday and Wednesday, like a mighty overwhelming torrent rolling from the mountains, it triumphantly prevailed in its rapid course over every obstruction. The long settled rocks were moved out of their places, the tallest oaks of the forest prostrated, and a highway indeed appeared for our God. On Wednesday, which was the closing day of the meeting, it might be truly said, as in the days of the Apostles, that great grace came upon the people. The divine presence was so manifest and glorious, that all prepossessions against rejoicing and praising God aloud, under the overflowings of his love, were made to give way, and many who had been cold and formal, caught the holy flame, and spoke of the wonderful things of

God. The meeting concluded on Wednesday evening at about five o'clock. It was impossible to ascertain the precise number of converts on this occasion. Some are of opinion that there were at least one hundred—besides thirty or forty who have since obtained mercy. It should have been observed, that nearly all the preachers, some on Monday evening, and others on Tuesday morning, were compelled to leave the ground, in order to attend Synod. This, in connexion with the fall of rain on the two first days, clearly evinces, that 'the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong;' and that the excellency of the power is not of men, but of God."

Nov. 28, 1832, contains a "Historical sketch of the Beech church," by Hugh Kirkpatrick, November 15. Incidentally, a noteworthy camp-meeting is described. As this is an authentic account of one of the most fruitful vines in our communion, we give it entire: "This society was organized in the memorable year 1800. A short time after, the neighborhood had built a tolerably comfortable log meeting-house, free for all denominations, upon a small parcel of land, donated by William Montgomery, Esq., and Mrs. Francis Ketting, deceased, for that purpose.

This house was occupied for a number of years principally by the Presbyterians and Methodists. The Rev. William McGee was at that time pastor of the Presbyterian church, under whose indefatigable labors considerable accessions were made.

In the year 1810, when the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was constituted, the Presbyterian society called by the name of the *Beech*, joined the Cumberland Presbyterians. The Rev. Wm. McGee continued several years after this, laboring indefatigably in the work of the ministry, whose labor was not in *vain in the Lord*; after which he removed without the bounds of the Beech church; and although his tongue has long been silent in the grave, and numbers of those who were brought to God through his instrumentality have gone with him to enjoy that rest which remains for the people of God, yet in him is exemplified that Scripture: *He being dead yet speaketh.* Heb. xi. 14.

The Beech church has never had a regular pastor since the removal of the Rev. William McGee, but has been mostly supplied by myself and itinerant preaching. Perhaps in no part of the world did more unanimity of feeling and brotherly love exist among different denominations, than did for a number of years with the Cumberland Presbyterians and Methodists at this place. But in process of time, disaffection began to spring up in the minds of the two churches, owing to a disagreement respecting the non-essentials of religion, which, in a great measure, destroyed that unanimity of feeling and charity which ought always to characterize the Church of God.

The house which had been built, which I before described, began to decay, and it being necessary to build a new and larger one, as the neighborhood had become more wealthy and populous, there was an attempt made to build a house upon the same principle of the first, (a free one): but not succeeding, the Cumberland Presbyterians concluded to build one exclusively for themselves—and were offered land to build on by two gentlemen, Messrs. Peter Ketting, and James Reed, not far distant. But reflecting that the neighborhood burying-ground was near the old meeting-house, and many of their relatives buried there, and expecting to be buried there themselves, they were loth to build at another place. However, at the time of their suspense, William Montgomery, Esq., proposed to give them a sufficient quantity of land joining that on which the old house stood, and assist them liberally to build a stone church fifty feet long and forty wide, exclusively for the Cumberland Presbyterians, which was most thankfully received by the society, and their most sanguine expectations were surpassed by the liberal donations of the neighborhood.

This house was completed in 1830; shortly after which a four days' meeting was appointed, at which time the house was in the most solemn manner dedicated to God. In the same year, the Rev. John L. Smith settled amongst us. He has preached to us for upwards of one year, half his time, on Sabbaths, and has been instrumental, under God, of promoting Christ's kingdom, not only by preaching the gospel, but

by vindicating the cause of temperance, and Sabbath-school societies.

In the year 1831, on the 30th of December, the church having previously been convinced, through the medium of your most excellent paper, of the desolating effects of intemperance, and the utility of temperance societies to suppress this most dreadful evil, met at the church, and, after an appropriate sermon, delivered by the Rev. John L. Smith, on the evil of intemperance, formed a society, which at present consists of one hundred and thirty-two members, twenty-seven of whom have professed religion since they joined the society.

On the 6th of May, 1832, the society, also through the medium of your paper, seeing the necessity of Sabbath-schools, after an appropriate sermon on this institution was delivered by the Rev. John Beard, formed a Sabbath-school, which for number far surpassed the most sanguine expectation of the warmest heart. And, being one of the superintendents of this school, I have the books before me, and find that it consists of one hundred and thirty scholars, and twenty-five teachers. Thirty-three of these Sunday-school teachers and scholars have since professed religion.

On the Thursday evening preceding the fourth Sabbath in August last, a camp-meeting commenced here, during which there was more excitement than had been witnessed for many years past. The camp-meeting closed on Wednesday morning, and it was ascertained that between thirty and forty had professed religion. As at all other camp-meetings, there were a number of persons left mourning for redemption through the blood of Christ, and through the solicitations of a number of the mourners, and the church feeling anxious to see further displays of the power of God in the conversion of sinners, appointed another camp-meeting to commence the Thursday before the second Sabbath in November. The church at this place having formerly labored under great disadvantages at camp-meetings, for want of a shelter, concluded, with the assistance of the neighborhood, to build a shelter for the accommodation of the congregation that might attend. They accordingly published their wish in the

neighborhood, in which the majority of the neighbors concurred; and I can truly say that I never saw people more heartily engage in any business, and in two weeks completed a shelter eighty feet long by fifty wide. The camp-meeting commenced on Thursday evening before the second Sabbath of November, as above stated. The brethren who preached seemed to feel the worth of souls, and their labor was not in vain in the Lord, for at the close of the meeting which was on Thursday evening, it was ascertained that upwards of five hundred had professed to find him of whom Moses, in the law, and the prophets did write—Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of God. Fifty-nine adults were baptized, and about one hundred and twenty-five joined the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Among those who professed was one of a miraculous kind, a negro boy about nineteen years of age, born deaf and dumb, who gave by signs the clearest evidence that his soul was washed from the pollution of sin, by the blood of the Lamb. It was remarked by some of the preachers, and a number of the aged members who had witnessed the revival of 1800, that the excitement exceeded any period they had ever witnessed. It was not confined to any particular class, but the aged, the middle-aged, and the young, were included in this glorious work. In view of what the Lord has done, and is yet doing for us, I conclude with the Psalmist, ‘Not unto us, but to thy great name be all the glory.’”

From the church records, I complete the sketch of the Beech to date. From 1831 to fall of 1835, Rev. John L. Smith was minister. Then Rev. R. C. Hatton to 1837. Then Rev. Wm. Eatherly and circuit-riders to 1843. Then Dr. A. G. Goodlet and circuit-riders to 1853. Rev. David A. Hunter to 1857. Rev. D. R. Marshall from 1858 to fall of 1865. Then Rev. J. D. Kirkpatrick to fall of 1867. Then Rev. D. R. Marshall to fall of 1872. Vacancy of a year. Then Rev. H. H. Marshall for one year, to fall of 1874, followed by a year’s vacancy. Rev. S. P. Chesnut is now in charge.

Feb. 13, 1833. The editorial under the heading “Sunday-schools” is of much interest. The sermon was doubtless by James Smith. “On Sunday last, according to a previous ap-

pointment, a sermon was delivered in the Cumberland Presbyterian church, to a large and attentive audience, on the subject of Sunday-schools. At the close of the discourse, an expression of liberality was given by the congregation, which, we think, has rarely been equalled in the country on such occasions. After the collection was made, for the purpose of procuring a library, several ladies and gentlemen signified their willingness to become teachers in the school, which will be organized on next Sabbath, in the Cumberland Presbyterian church, at 9 o'clock A. M.

The funds collected will enable the committee appointed to procure a very extensive library, which will be distributed among the pupils weekly, and cannot fail to render the school highly interesting.

Parents who design sending their children to this school, would do well to have them there at the commencement, that such arrangements may be made in classification, etc., as the convenience of the teachers, and interest of the school may require.

It should never be forgotten, that the efficacy of Sunday-schools, so far as human agency is concerned, depends mainly on three things:

First. Parents should improve every circumstance at home, that would be calculated to interest the feelings of their children in favor of going to the Sunday-school; and in order to do this, they should be careful to have their own feelings interested on the subject. If children discover that their parents are indifferent, they will soon become so to. But, on the other hand, if parents appear to be pleased that their children have the opportunity of attending the Sunday-school, inquire what they are learning, speak of the excellencies of the little books drawn from the library, etc., they will attach an importance to the subject, in the estimation of their children, which will be sure to interest their feelings.

Secondly. Prompt attention, on the part of teachers, will be indispensable. Their classes, after becoming attached to them, will feel a kind of commendable ambition in preparing their lessons, so as to gratify them, and receive their praise, and when they enter the school, and find their

teacher absent, discouragement will immediately be felt, and a few more disappointments of the same kind, will paralyze all the energies of the class. Therefore, we insist on it, that trivial circumstances should never prevent a teacher from attending strictly to his class, and when necessity compels him to be absent, his place should be filled by one who will attend with interest to the duties of his office—everything depends on keeping the feelings of the student enlisted.

Thirdly. The prayers of the church are necessary to secure the prosperity of Sabbath-schools, for, it will forever remain true, that without God we can do nothing."

April 10, 1833. A terse editorial thus pointedly puts one phase of the mooted question as to the training of preachers: " * * young men laboring under impressions to preach the gospel. They should not wait, if poor, for the church to raise funds to send them to college, or, till a theological seminary is opened for their benefit. No; let them make their cases known to Presbytery, and if received as candidates, and they have it not in their power to enjoy the benefits of Cumberland College, let them enter a common school; and if means cannot be commanded, let them mount their horse, and take their books in their saddle-bags, and unite with some brother on the circuit, who is emphatically a laborer, not a gentleman, and study day and night, receiving what instruction they can from the zealous, enterprizing circuit-rider; and our word for it, they will soon be qualified to enter the field alone. And if we are not mistaken, men who enter the ministry under such circumstances as these, will be the men at last, who will be most willing to encounter the swamps and quagmires of our new countries. We know that learning, in the fullest sense of the word, is far from disqualifying a man to preach the gospel to an ignorant people. But are the preachers who are capable of measuring with an elevated standard in literary attainments, most ready to repair to those neighborhoods where the people assemble to worship God in an *old* school-house, or in an *old* shell of a meeting-house, in which they sit on rough slab benches, and where there is but little prospect of pecuniary reward for ministerial services? We have our doubts, whether the preacher who is

capable of commanding a salary in town, or a wealthy neighborhood, would be willing to take a circuit under such circumstances.

Not a syllable is here uttered against a learned preacher, or against preachers taking a station, a salary, etc.; nor would we be understood as objecting to the practice of rearing up colleges and theological seminaries, for the benefit of candidates for the ministry. This is all right; but we hope ever to frown upon the idea of requiring *all candidates* to pass to the sacred office, through these channels. And it is truly sickening to us, to hear a preacher of the gospel who has been blessed with the means of acquiring a liberal education, and is now enjoying a *fat* salary, railing out against an unlearned minister, who is performing services *without* pay which he would be unwilling to undertake, and whose labors are obviously owned of heaven."

June 5, 1833. D. Lowry retires; James Smith remains, sole editor and proprietor. On June 26, Mr. Lowry left Nashville for Prairie du Chien, on the Mississippi river, four hundred miles above St. Louis, in what was then Michigan Territory, now Wisconsin. He was appointed by the United States government to superintend a school, which, according to a treaty with the Winnebago Indians, was to be sustained by the National Treasury for twenty-seven years.

March 19, 1834. Occurs a short editorial which furnishes much material for reflection. "'Gradual Emancipation.' Under this head, in a former number (December 25, 1833), we gave our readers a brief account of the organization of a society in Lexington, Kentucky, composed chiefly of slave-holders, who, by becoming members, pledge themselves to emancipate all slaves born their property thereafter, as they attain to the age of twenty-five years.

We earnestly invite attention to the subjoined speech of Mr. Birney, on this momentous subject. We have never become partisan respecting the great fomenting questions, Abolition and Colonization; nor do we intend to engage in that heated controversy. But for a Christian or philanthropist, at this late day, to remain silent or indifferent on the subject of slavery, is criminal. The hope that slavery will be

perpetuated is a delusion—a desire that it should be a disgrace upon humanity. The negro will be freed; and we *must* liberate him, or God will do it at our expense. No man who believes God, and has power to do his will, *can* doubt this position. Therefore, the first question for us to determine, is, whether we will free the negro as an act of justice and humanity, or slumber on in false security until the mutterings of injured justice arouse us, and the storm of retribution be poured out without mixture. If we would avert the judgments of heaven; if we would not entail upon ourselves and our posterity worse than Egyptian plagues, the next question is, how shall we free the black man? The abolitionist says, proclaim the negro free and receive him as a citizen, and the work is done. Slave-holders know that immediate and entire abolition would multiply existing evils a thousand fold. Yet *justice, humanity, and religion*, call for emancipation, and reason dictates *gradual* emancipation. We cannot err by adopting this scheme. Let the termination of slavery be as it may, gradual emancipation must be right so far as it proceeds. Let us begin to act upon the principle, and let time determine the progress of the scheme. By remaining inactive, we will pull down upon our own heads heaven's red-hot vengeance. Let us be up and doing. Our sister State has set a worthy example. Let not Tennessee be too proud to emulate her sister in good works. Kentucky will yet be numbered among the free States. What will Tennessee do?

We forbear to add further remarks, but will give place to Mr. Birney." Then follows a column and a half from *The Western Luminary*, under the heading, "Prospective Gradual Emancipation," being an outline of the remarks made in the court-house at Lexington, by Mr. James G. Birney, of Mercer county, Kentucky, explanatory of the principles, object, etc., of the "Kentucky Society for the relief of the State from Slavery."

June 25, 1834. The editor reiterates above views, while he declines to open his columns to a general discussion of the topic.

Had the politicians left the subject to the preachers, there

can be but little doubt that slavery would have been terminated in due time, at far less cost than twelve thousand millions of dollars, and one million of lives.

Looking at the early and deep-rooted anti-slavery sentiment which prevailed in the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, its unity before, during, and since the great Civil War, is readily explained. The preachers in this communion in the slave states never pushed themselves forward as *jure divino*, defenders of, or apologists for, slavery. Hence the agitation which sundered the Methodist and Baptist Churches, and kept the Presbyterians in uncomfortably hot water, raised hardly a ripple to incommod them. And "when heaven's red-hot vengeance" was poured out upon a self-willed and perverse land, through all its length and breadth, still they preserved their equanimity, and remained undivided, giving heed to the voices of Milton Bird and his co-workers, urging them to stand still and watch the judgments of the righteous God, and await salvation from the Lord. Why should not a Church so highly favored aim at and undertake a great work for Africa in America, and in Africa through America?

Perhaps the most spicy and interesting specimen of controversy found in the pages of the *Revivalist*, is the one in which Ewing, Miller, and the editor participated. As a specimen of the time and patience required to overcome prejudice and misrepresentation, and also as bringing in close and sharp contact the honored founder of our own ecclesiastical organization, and the celebrated polemic and polished scholar of the parent Church, it is invested with instructive interest.

June 19, 1833. The editor says: "Below, our readers will find a letter from the Rev. Finis Ewing, addressed to Dr. Miller, which was elicited by certain remarks made by the Doctor on the difficulties that occurred in the Presbyterian Church in the West during the revival of 1800.

"From the very cursory view we have taken of these letters, we are disposed to believe that the worthy Doctor is not correctly informed concerning the doctrines and practices of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Thus, in Letter V., he

represents our creed ‘unscriptural,’ and our practices ‘fanatical, revolting irregularities.’ We presume the Doctor has never seen our creed as it is exhibited in our Confession of Faith. If he has, will he be so kind as to point out in what particulars it is unscriptural. We believe it to be a faithful exhibit of the doctrines taught in the Word of God. We, moreover, believe that it is the system embraced by nine-tenths of the lay-members of the denomination to which the Doctor belongs. If our practices are fanatical and irregular, we are ignorant of it. Will the worthy Doctor be pleased to point out in what respects they are so. In Letter XI., the Doctor represents our people as being as fanatical as our preachers. This we believe is true; for it is an old and true saying—‘Like priest, like people.’ For the information of the Doctor, we state that this fanatical people have the honor of including among them as much of the influence, intelligence, and Christian zeal, of the community, as any denomination in the West.

“Some of our brethren have lately complained at our silence with regard to these letters, in which the Cumberland Presbyterians are misrepresented in several instances. To such we reply, that our avocations were so numerous and pressing, we had not perused them when their complaints reached us.”

Next follows what I do not find mentioned in Cossitt’s full and excellent “Life,” etc., and hence give entire:

For the Revivalist.

To SAMUEL MILLER, D.D., of Princeton, N. J.:

Reverend Sir—Nothing but a strict adherence to the principle that every man is morally bound to do all the good, and prevent all the evil, in his power, could have overcome my reluctance to address you in this public manner. But, in one of your ‘series’ of letters addressed to your brethren, in the numbers for March last, you undertake to give a narrative of the difficulties that occurred in the Presbyterian Church in the West, about thirty years ago, which is calculated to fix very unjust impressions on the public mind, and which I feel it my duty, as an eye-witness of the transactions, to correct. I shall quote from your letter, as published in the *Western Luminary*.

"In the fruitfulness of your imagination, you have formed a *common stock*, which, agreeably to *your* showing, was produced by the irregular proceedings of one of these Presbyteries, and afterwards identified by the 'decisive course of the Kentucky Synod, by cutting off from the Presbyterian Church' this heterogeneous mass!—of which you have made three sub-divisions, assigning the 'majority' to the Cumberland Presbyterians, another part to the Socinians, and a third part to the Shakers. Having all sprung from the same common source, you leave it to be inferred, of course, that there is no great *difference* among them. Permit me to say, reverend sir, with due deference, that in your garbled account of those transactions, you calumniated the *living* and the *dead*. Your history is a shameless misrepresentation of *facts* as they *did* and *do* exist. 1. It is not true, that the great work of God at that time, which, in your outset, you call "a remarkable revival of religion," was suddenly turned into a 'fanatical excitement.' 2. It is not true, that those young men who applied for license, 'with very few exceptions, all turned out grossly heterodox and disorderly!' 3. It is not true, that these young men, 'cut off' by the Synod of Kentucky, 'were entirely destitute of *any* suitable education.' 4. It is not true, that one, or, as you say, 'another, but smaller portion, formed a new body, denominated "Christians," and sometimes "New Lights," or "Stoneites" (from the name of their principal leader), and became a kind of enthusiastic and noisy Socinians.' 5. It is not true, as you have said, 'the remainder, under the same lawless impulse, took a third course, and fell into all the fanatical absurdities of "Shakerism."'* 6. It is not true, that the preachers who

*Stone who became a "Socinian," Houston, Dunlary, McMann, and Rankin, who became "Shakers," were all licensed and ordained by Dr. Miller's Church, *before* any difficulty arose in the Kentucky Synod, with regard to the "young men." None of them ever were Cumberland Presbyterians. Not one preacher "excluded" by the high-handed measures of the Synod, ever joined Stone's party, or the Shakers. Therefore it would have been more just for the reverend doctor to have searched for the *cause* in his *own* system, for those "monuments of the most disastrous character which remain for our (his) instruction and warning to the present day."

became Cumberland Presbyterians, did then or do now, 'avowedly embrace the Arminian sentiments in theology.' 7. It is not true, that 'they would have corrupted and disgraced your Church, had they continued in it.' We are now fairly and fully at issue.

"Then, sir, as you have made these statements in the face of the American Churches and the world, I call upon you for the *proof*. If you do not produce it, I repeat, you must, you will, stand charged by an impartial public with gross misrepresentation. Here I might rest the matter and wait for your proof. But, I will add, that there are thousands of *living* witnesses in the West, who *know* that the first *five* statements which I have arranged and *denied*, are utterly untrue. Our Confession of Faith, and all our publications on doctrines, go directly to disprove the charge which I have numbered as the sixth. And, as it regards the seventh and last charge, I will venture the assertion, that *two-thirds* of the whole American people in the West would pronounce it a calumny. What! *King, Donnell, Harris, Chapman, Porter, Calhoun, Barnett, Kirkpatrick, and Foster*, 'corrupt and disgrace your Church had they continued in it'?—and an host of others whom they have introduced into the ministry, as orthodox, talented, zealous, and useful as themselves? Would these have corrupted and disgraced your Church? From my inmost soul I thank the God of life that nearly all of those men yet live to *disprove*, in the face of tens of thousands, your unwarranted assertions.

"Permit me, in conclusion, to ask you a few plain questions. Are you aware that the most pious and most zealous part of your *preachers* and *people*, who are *best* acquainted with us, manifest every disposition to cultivate a close and intimate friendship with the Cumberland Presbyterians? Are you aware of the filial attachment (if not interrupted by a *few* D.D.'s) of that body to the 'Mother Church'? Are you aware that the Cumberland Presbyterians, as a body, are most heartily promoting (on a broad national scale) the benevolent institutions of the day, and are closely connected with many of your own Church in this holy work? Are you aware that the very people you, and a few more of your

reverend doctors, have been trying to disparage, are the humble instruments, in God's hands, of the salvation of thousands of precious souls every year? Finally, were you quite sure, that when you were casting reproach upon us, you were doing 'all to the glory of God'?

I am, reverend sir, with due respect,

FINIS EWING.

~~RE~~ It is requested, as an act of *justice*, that all those editors who have published Dr. Miller's letter, will give this an insertion.

F. E."

No one acquainted with the manly characters and noble services of Ewing and his compeers, will need be surprised that they were deeply wounded by being held up to all the Christian world at home and abroad, through such grotesque caricatures. And more especially as this was done with great weight and authority by one of the widest read and most influential divines in a communion to which *their attachment was filial*. Hence the above plain-spoken and indignant remonstrance. Doubtless Dr. Miller, fair-minded and far removed from intentional misrepresentation, was not a little surprised and vexed when he first read its energetic, outspoken Anglo-Saxon. He had, probably, quoted from others, with the design of pointing a moral and adorning a tale, and had not thought it worth his while to become minutely acquainted with the ecclesiastical history of the remote wilderness. He seems at first to have endeavored to avoid the unpleasant topic by silence. And it is not likely that the many influential and widely circulated journals which had delighted to copy his letters, cared to comply with the closing request of his rough and ready western antagonist. We find the following editorial and extract in the issue of

October 16, 1833. "DR. MILLER.—Our readers will remember, that in June last we published a letter from the Rev. Finis Ewing, addressed to the reverend gentleman, whose name heads this article, with a request from Bro. Ewing, that all those papers which had published Dr. M.'s letters, should give his reply an insertion. Dr. Miller we have long esteemed as an honorable man, and one of the brightest lights of the western Church.

When we read his misrepresentations of the Cumberland Presbyterians, we were pained to the heart, that one of his high standing should lend himself to defame and misrepresent a people whose practices have been owned of heaven in the salvation of thousands of immortal souls, and who are doing as much toward evangelizing the Valley of the Mississippi as any other branch of the Church of Christ. We then thought, and still think, that the Doctor was led astray by the gross misrepresentations of such men as Dr. Wilson, of Cincinnati, and a certain Dr. Bishop, both of whom have published to the world the most foul slanders on the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, and have represented her doctrines and practices in the most odious light. And we confidently expected that the Doctor, on perusing Bro. E.'s letter, would inquire into our doctrines and practices, and make the *amende honorable*; but to our surprise he has remained silent. We do not believe that a gentleman of the Doctor's judgment, can flatter himself that with impunity he can attempt to put a stain on the character and conduct of sixty thousand Christian citizens of these United States. But we are sorry to find that with all his piety and learning, he has not sufficient humility to acknowledge that he has, for once, written too hastily, and thereby handed down to future generations, a document which must necessarily make injurious impressions on their minds concerning the fathers of what will then be, a very extensive branch of the Church of Christ.

As an evidence that all the members of the Presbyterian Church do not approve of the Doctor's course, we insert below some remarks on the subject, published by the editor of the New York *Evangelist*, in August last:

'DR. MILLER AND THE CUMBERLAND PRESBYTERIANS.—In a "Series of Letters to Presbyterians," published in some of the newspapers last winter, and since collected into a volume, Dr. Miller gave his views on a great many topics interesting to the Presbyterian Church, and among others the subject of revivals. In order to enforce his particular ideas concerning revival measures, he appealed to the results of the great revivals in Kentucky, in the early part of the present cen-

tury, and particularly to the controversy which issued in the formation of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. This he exhibited in such a manner as to give a very unfavorable appearance to that Church, in respect to its origin of principles, and such as must necessarily be very painful to its ministers and members. For some years we have uniformly heard from agents of societies, and others in the West, that they found no more bold and devoted co-operators than among the Cumberland Presbyterians. The Bible, Tract, and Temperance Societies are much indebted to them. They have a respectable college at Princeton, Kentucky, and a paper at Nashville, which is ably and evangelically edited. In short, if we are to judge of a tree by its fruits, we suppose there is no equal body of professed believers in the Western States better entitled to the character of a branch of the Christian vine. Dr. Miller's disparaging letter, therefore, has very naturally called forth a brief defense, from Rev. Finis Ewing, which was published in the *Revivalist*, with a special request from Mr. E., that all those papers which published Dr. M.'s letters, should, "as an act of justice," give an insertion to the reply. As the *New York Observer*, the *Presbyterian*, the *Boston Recorder*, and other papers east of the mountains, which published Dr. M.'s letters, more or less, have none of them seen fit to comply with this request; and as it seems reasonable that our Cumberland brethren should be heard in vindication, when assailed in the part of the country where they are least known, we have concluded to publish Mr. Ewing's letter. We could have wished its manner had been a little more mild, but we apprehend that Dr. M. did not show his usual courtesy in the attack which called it forth."

My readers will find much room for reflection and comment in the above, which does its writer so much credit for candor and fairness. Are we, as in old times, bold and devoted co-operators in the great practical work of the Church? Is there to-day, if a tree is to be judged by its fruits, no equal body of professed believers in the Western States? Again, is not the best way of correcting the eastern supercilious ignorance of the West and South, which is still so prevalent, so obstinate, and so wilfully blind, now as then, to lay our-

selves out for the moral, intellectual, and religious development of our own mighty region? The West and the South, in relation to the East and the North, must go through the same process as has America in relation to England. The stages of gross ignorance, ridiculous misrepresentations, gradual information, and final knowledge and respect will succeed each other, sooner or later, in accordance with our work and merit.

Dr. Miller was at length induced to notice Ewing's protest, and in the *Revivalist* of December 5, 1833, we find from him a letter more in accordance with his character for courtesy and candor.

“TO THE EDITOR OF THE REVIVALIST:

Reverend Sir—I have seen two communications in your paper which seem to demand my notice. One was in June last, addressed to me by the Rev. Finis Ewing, and animadverting, with no little severity, on certain published remarks of mine, on the *rise* of Cumberland Presbyterians. The other consists of remarks, which appear to be editorial, in the *Revivalist* of October 16, calling my attention a second time to the subject. Of the former I took no public notice at the time of its appearance, partly because it reached my hands at a time when I was more than usually pressed by multiplied engagements; and partly because it appeared to me so strongly marked by acrimonious and even uncourteous language, that I felt unwilling to engage in a controversial correspondence which promised to be productive of so little, either satisfactory or useful. Your recurrence to the subject on the 16th ult., seems to render it improper that I should be any longer silent; and the manner in which you have treated the subject, allows me to respond.

My reason for referring to the painful circumstances which attended the rise of the Cumberland Presbyterians, was, not to gratify any feelings of petulance, far less, I hope, of malignity, toward that body; but merely to put the Church with which it is my happiness to be connected, on her guard against similar evils, with which, in some parts of her bounds, I suppose her to be threatened. With this view, I wrote what I verily thought at the time, was unexaggerated

truth; and am not yet convinced that it was materially otherwise. My acquaintance, indeed, with the origin and subsequent history of the Cumberland Presbyterians is by no means either so extensive, or so accurate in regard to minute details, as I wish it was. Yet I have attended somewhat carefully to the 'History' of the controversy relative to the Cumberland Presbytery, published by the Synod of Kentucky; to the account of the origin of your body, given by the Rev. President Bishop, in connection with his 'Memoirs of the Rev. Mr. Rice;' and also to your own Confession of Faith and Form of Church Government, as published under the authority of your highest judicatory. From an attentive perusal of these publications, I thought myself warranted in making the statements which I did in one of my 'Letters to Presbyterians.' If I misrepresented any facts, or employed one word of censure more than was merited, no one can more sincerely regret the mistake than I shall when convinced of it. My confidence in Dr. Bishop led me to assume with entire assurance, the truth of all his statements; and I am still persuaded that he is incapable of wilful misrepresentation.

Mr. Ewing denies that the body with which he is connected is *Arminian* in its creed. I am not able to interpret its published 'Confession of Faith' upon any other than *Arminian* principles. It is true, that Confession maintains the doctrine of the *perseverance of the saints*, which *modern Arminians* reject. But Mr. Ewing probably knows that *Arminius* himself did not deny that doctrine, but studiously left it doubtful, and professed to regard the reception of it as consistent with his general system.

I assure you, Mr. Editor, that when you accuse me of not having "sufficient humility to acknowledge that I have for once written too hastily," you do me real injustice. I have not a feeling which would stand in the way of such an acknowledgement, the moment sufficient evidence of that fact was presented. This is all I want. I can also say, with the utmost sincerity, that I rejoice to see so many indications that the Cumberland Presbyterians value learning and suitable training in the gospel ministry more than they once did, and

that their body has been, of late years, and in several respects, marked by very distinct improvement. And if this improvement should go on until the way be safely open, in consistency with our principles, for correspondence, and even, at length, union, with our General Assembly, no one will rejoice in such an event more cordially than myself. I have no expectation of living to see such an union, but I do not give up the hope that those who come after me will witness it. But, for one, I must candidly say, that much as I respect the character of some individuals of your body, known to me by reputation only, and much as I desire the unity of the body of Christ, I would not raise my voice for such a correspondence or union, at the expense of any one of those great landmarks of truth or order for which we have so long and so painfully contended.

I mean to make further inquiry respecting the exact truth of my statements, of which you have complained, and, if I should detect the least *material* error, you may expect to hear from me again.

I am, sir, very respectfully yours,

SAMUEL MILLER.

PRINCETON, N. J., Nov. 11, 1833.

Feb. 12, 1834. Contains a letter from the editor, in response to the above, over a column in length. I give extracts:

“Reverend Sir:—A long absence from home, must be my apology for not responding before this time to your favor of the 11th of November, which reached me in Pennsylvania, late in December.

In your letter, you complain of the severity of Mr. Ewing’s animadversions on your published remarks on the rise of the Cumberland Presbyterians. But was there no cause for such severity? were not those remarks calculated to make a very injurious impression upon the minds of persons who reside where the true character of Cumberland Presbyterians is not known? and was not the conviction that they were false, and a knowledge of their tendency, sufficient to excite indignation, not only in the mind of Mr. Ewing, but of every person who bears the Cumberland Presbyterian name? You, sir, must know that the fact that we were branded by Dr. Miller throughout the United States as *heretics* and *fanatics*, was

well calculated to excite painful feelings in the minds of all the members of our body, and certainly it was no more than could be expected, that one of our ministers, who was well acquainted with the rise and doctrines of our Church, should reply somewhat sharply. I acknowledge that to me your remarks were exceedingly painful, proceeding, as they did, from such a respectable source. * * * * *

I cordially agree with Mr. Ewing, in denying that the Cumberland Presbyterian body is Arminian in its creed. It is true, that some of our articles of faith are the same as those taught by Arminius, and you know that some are the same as were taught by John Calvin. You say that you cannot explain our Confession of Faith but upon Arminian principles, and some of our Methodist brethren have said that our Confession could be explained only upon Calvinistic principles. Besides, you know that there is a great difference betwixt the doctrines taught by Arminius, and those believed by Arminians in the present day.

But is it right—is it becoming in an enlightened minister of the gospel to proclaim abroad that a body of Christians are heretics, because they believe and teach the doctrines of Arminius? If so, what name will you give the Episcopilians, and the Methodists, who must be much more thorough-going *heretics* than the Cumberland Presbyterians, who, according to your own acknowledgment, hold the doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints, and that, too, in neither dark nor equivocal terms, as did Arminius."

March 12, 1834. The fact is noticed, that the *Orthodox Presbyterian*, published at Belfast, Ireland, is re-publishing large extracts from Dr. Miller's letters, and thus disseminating his views of the Cumberland Presbyterians more widely still.

April 9, 1834. Contains a four-column letter from the editor to Dr. Miller, principally refuting President Bishop's statements by copious extracts from early documents.

April 16, 1834. Another letter to Dr. Miller of a column and a half, mainly referring to the revival of 1800. It opens thus:

"In my last, I proved that the Cumberland Presbyterians did not originate at meetings where the people assembled to

talk, and leap, and shout, and exhort, and dispute, as Dr. Bishop would have us believe; but that they had their origin in a great and glorious revival of religion.

I also gave you a sample of the 'decisive measures' of the Kentucky Synod, derived, not from those who might be disposed to put an unfair construction upon their proceedings, but from their own relation of their conduct in that unhappy affair; and I leave you and a candid public to judge whether their measures are warranted by the word of God. I also proved, from the testimony of the commission of the Synod, that 'the soul-damning heresy for which the Presbyterian Church spewed the members of Cumberland Presbytery out of her mouth,' consisted in their believing and teaching that every man has a sufficiency of grace, which, if he improve, he will obtain more, until he arrive at true conversion.

So, sir, from that document it appears, because the members of that Presbytery, and the young men licensed by them dared, dared sincerely, to offer salvation to all men, they have been held up to the view of the American public, as a proverb, a hissing, and a by-word; and Dr. Miller, notwithstanding his usual moderation, has been induced, (I trust unwittingly,) to unite in an unholy crusade against men, who had the honesty and fortitude to refuse to subscribe to an article in the Confession of Faith, which they sincerely believed was derogatory to the glory of God, and which, if I am not greatly mistaken, a large majority of the members of the Presbyterian Church would tremble to say that they believed it.

That the members of the Cumberland Presbytery did not err in some instances I dare not say. Yet, when we consider that they were placed in very trying circumstances, they evidently acted with as much prudence as could be expected from men situated as they were.

Their sin did not consist in licensing and ordaining young men destitute of a classical education, for the Presbyterian Church subsequently recognized and confirmed their acts in licensing and ordaining those who adopted the obnoxious article, although it could be demonstrated that they were des-

titute of the literary qualifications required by the discipline of your church. But the majority of the members of Cumberland Presbytery being Calvinists in the strictest sense of the word, were thus severely handled for their liberality in licensing men who could not, in every particular, see as they saw, and think as they thought. This remark is peculiarly applicable to the venerated McGready, the great instrument in beginning and carrying on the glorious revival of 1800, who, in no instance, deviated from the Confession of Faith, but believed and taught that Christ died for his Church, which would be saved. Indeed, if we may judge from his published sermons, and his manuscripts now in my possession, he was, in the strictest sense of the term, an old school Presbyterian, as far as doctrines are concerned."

April 23, 1834. This, and the preceding numbers, give six columns of extracts from the Minutes of Cumberland and Transylvania Presbyteries, and those of the Synod of Kentucky, throwing light upon the origin of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

This date also has a three column editorial letter to Dr. Miller contrasting the two Confessions of Faith.

June 18, 1834. The controversy is brought to an end.
"Letter from Dr. Miller to the editor of the *Revivalist*.

REVEREND SIR.—In the letter which I addressed to you in November last, I expressed my intention of examining anew the circumstances attending the rise of the Cumberland Presbyterians, and promised that, if I found any material error in the statement which I had made respecting them in the eleventh of my 'Letters to Presbyterians,' you should hear from me again. I am sorry that so much delay has arisen in the fulfillment of the purpose then expressed, but a variety of circumstances have rendered it unavoidable. With a detailed statement of these, it would be improper to trouble you. I sit down now to assure you, that I have not forgotten my promise, and that, instead of reluctance, I feel cordial pleasure in repairing an injury which certainly was not intended.

After as careful a review of all the circumstances attending the rise of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, as I have

had time to make, I am perfectly satisfied that my general statement, in the letter above alluded to, is correct. For example, all my inquiries more and more confirm my confidence in the truth of the following facts:

1. That the original troubles in the Cumberland Presbytery grew, as I stated, out of a remarkable religious excitement, which, however genuine in its commencement, and however connected in its progress with many sound conversions, was attended with many deplorable disorders, and followed by consequences of the most disastrous character.

2. That the Cumberland Presbytery, formed in the midst of this morbid excitement, did, very soon after its formation, proceed to license, and afterwards ordain, a number of young men, who were in a great measure destitute of those literary qualifications which are required by the constitution of our Church, and who refused to subscribe to our Confession of Faith, etc., in the manner prescribed and in use among us.

3. That these irregular and disorderly acts of the Cumberland Presbytery gave rise to grievous and protracted troubles in the Western Church; that the Synod of Kentucky refused to acknowledge the constitutional introduction into our body of the men thus licensed and ordained; that they were finally obliged to dissolve their Presbytery, and annex such of its members as remained regular to a neighboring Presbytery; and that the General Assembly ultimately sanctioned these proceedings as, in substance, wise and salutary.

4. That the irregular men, thus ejected, proceeded to form a new body, under the name of Cumberland Presbyterians, that when they published their creed and constitution, it was with such alterations from our formularies as made it perfectly apparent that they could not have remained either comfortable or safe, or even honest members of our body; and that they, for many years afterwards, indulged those disorders in worship, and that disregard of literary qualifications in candidates for the sacred office, which evinced that their excision from our communion was wise, seasonable, and necessary.

Of these facts I cannot doubt. And they are all that it was really to my purpose to establish in the letter to which I

have alluded. Yet I owe it to truth and to candor to say, that, as I wrote hastily, chiefly from general recollection, and with very little reference to documents—I fell into several mistakes in point of historical fact, and indulged in modes of expression which I now regret, and which, if the ‘Letters’ in question should ever reach a second edition (which is not probable), it is my purpose carefully to correct.

My principal mistakes, both of fact and expression, were the following, which I feel no other pain in acknowledging, than that which arises from the consciousness of having, inadvertently, done the least injustice to any individual or body of men.

1. I am now convinced, that in representing the ‘New Lights,’ or ‘Stoneites,’ the ‘Shakers,’ and the Cumberland Presbyterians as exfoliations from the same disorderly body, and about the same time, I wrote under a misapprehension of facts. For although I cannot resist the conviction, that the disorders in all these bodies had, ~~remotely~~, a common origin in the wonderful excitement of 1802 and 1803; yet I am sensible that in my statement, justice was not, in this respect, done to the Cumberland Presbyterians. Neither the Stoneites nor the Shakers ever made constituent parts of their body.

The ‘Stoneites’ and ‘Shakers,’ I am now aware, were separated from our Church several years anterior to the departure and separate organization of the Cumberland Presbyterians. After the most careful inquiry, I cannot find that any Cumberland preacher ever became a ‘Chrystian,’ or ‘Stoneite,’ and but one a ‘Shaker,’ and he was not one of the young men who had been licensed in the disorderly manner of which complaint has been made.

2. When I stated that the persons licensed and ordained in the irregular manner above mentioned, with few exceptions, turned out ‘grossly heterodox and disorderly,’ and ‘could not have failed, if they had remained in our church, to corrupt as well as to disturb and disgrace it;’ I employed language which I now regret. I am now satisfied that none of the young men above alluded to, fell into the worst heresies described in my letter; and, as to the Arminian or Ar-

minianish alteration of the Confession of Faith, by the Cumberland Presbyterians—much as I dislike Arminianism, and injurious as I verily deem it to the interest of genuine religion—I should be unwilling, upon reflection, to apply to that modification of the system, which our Cumberland Presbyterian brethren avow, the character of ‘gross heresy.’

I repeat, Mr. Editor, that the mistakes, which I here take pleasure in correcting, were made from pure inadvertence, and I have not a feeling which tempts me to shrink from their correction. I should never have said a word in the way of censure against your body, if the hope of benefiting my own denomination, in its present circumstances, had not constrained me. And, in uttering what I did, for this benevolent purpose, it never occurred to me that I was inflicting the smallest wrong upon any one. I meant to speak nothing but simple, unmixed verity, and certainly could have no interest in anything else.

I have only to say, in conclusion, what I suggested in my former letter, that it gives me pleasure to observe that the Cumberland Presbyterians, within a few years past, have begun to take juster views, and to pursue, what I must deem a wiser course than formerly, respecting literary qualifications for the ministry, and, if I mistake not, also, in respect to several forms of disorder, once practised much more extensively than at present. In this, no one can rejoice more cordially than myself. I acknowledge, too, that the acquaintance which I have lately formed with several of the licentiates of your body has served to raise my estimate of its respectability and prospects. May every species of improvement, both in your Church and in ours, proceed, until all who bear the Presbyterian name in the United States, may be perfectly united in the truth, and in every good word and work.

I am, Reverend Sir, very respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL MILLER.”

PRINCETON, N. J., May 29, 1834.

REMARKS.

“Above, our readers have a letter from Dr. Miller, which we have read with surprise and pity. We are surprised that the

Doctor will persist in vindicating the conduct of Kentucky Synod in the affair of Cumberland Presbytery, when a majority of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, and himself among the number, censured their proceedings, and wrote a letter to them to that effect. We are surprised that Dr. Miller should call that 'a morbid excitement,' which thousands, now living, know was a glorious revival of religion, and is still progressing through the instrumentality of the Methodist brethren and the descendants of the revival party of the Cumberland Presbytery. We are surprised that the Doctor should assert, that the Cumberland Presbyterians, the Stoneites, etc., had a common origin in the same 'morbid excitement.' With equal propriety may it be said, that the genuine followers of Christ, and the Nicolaitans had a common origin in the "morbid excitement" on the day of Pentecost. We are surprised that the Doctor, who is Professor of Ecclesiastical History, by his own acknowledgment, should be ignorant of the history of his own Church in his own day. We are surprised that the Doctor should persist in asserting that the revival members of Cumberland Presbytery were "ejected," when they were only silenced, and that illegally, by Kentucky Synod. A perusal of the documents we have published, will convince every candid person that, in that affair, the Kentucky Synod, acted exceedingly disorderly, and if the testimony of Dr. Wilson, of Philadelphia, who was one of the brightest lights in the Presbyterian Church, is worth anything, even the General Assembly of that body evinced a want of independence and decision, which fully justified the revival members of Cumberland Presbytery in forming a new denomination.

We pity the man whose benevolence is of such a nature as to 'constrain' him to hold up to public view a respectable and evangelical body of Christians as heretics and fanatics, in hope of benefiting his own party; and we think that no great discernment was necessary to convince him of the injustice of such an act. But it appears the Doctor never dreamed he was doing wrong to any one. Certainly, if he did not suspect he was doing wrong to any one, at least he knew that the effect of his benevolence must be extremely painful to

the feelings of those whose character was thus torn and murdered for the advantage of his own denomination. We do solicit that the Doctor will not teach our young men, now under his care, such benevolence; for if he does, our denomination will have no further use for them, our maxim being, to do unto others as we would be done by.

As regards the Dr's. concessions, we are disposed to do him full justice—in them he evinces the gentleman and the Christian, but even here he errs, for no Cumberland Presbyterian preacher ever became a Shaker. Rankin was a Presbyterian and joined the Shakers before the Cumberland Presbyterian Church was constituted.

The doctrines taught and believed by us are not only not 'gross heresy,' but they are not heretical at all—they are precious truths of God. How would Presbyterians stare, if Episcopalians, Methodists, and Cumberland Presbyterians would publish to the world that the peculiar dogmas of the Presbyterian Church are gross heresies! Now, we have the same right to act thus, that Dr. Miller and Joshua L. Wilson have to call us heretics, and we think that we would have more truth upon our side, and vast numbers of Presbyterians are convinced of the fact; hence the uneasiness manifested by them when that precious chapter on the decrees is called in question.

If our people take juster views and pursue a wiser course with regard to the literary qualifications of the ministry now, than formerly, we are not aware of it. We take the same views, and pursue the same course in this respect with our older brethren when they constituted our Church, who licensed and ordained men who had no knowledge of the dead languages, but inculcated upon all who could, conveniently, the propriety and importance of acquiring a competent knowledge of them. And at this day we have not more men in the ministry, in proportion to the whole body, who are masters of these languages, than we had six months after our Church was constituted. In our humble opinion, the great stress laid by some of our Presbyterian brethren on the deficiency of our ministers as regards a knowledge of the dead languages, is quite ridiculous. For Dr. Miller knows, and

we know, that not one in ten of the Presbyterian ministers are masters of the dead languages. It is true, they may possess a smattering, but comparatively few of them can read a chapter of the Greek Testament correctly. Nine-tenths of the Presbyterian ministers in these United States would tremble to be put to the test by competent judges in the presence of an intelligent audience.

We Cumberland Presbyterians inculcate upon all our candidates for the ministry, who can, conveniently, the propriety of studying the dead languages, especially the Greek scriptures; and, as soon as it was practicable, the very men Dr. Miller and others represent as 'ejected from the Presbyterian Church for their ignorance and disorders,' established a college for this and other purposes. But we know that the most learned man is not always the most holy and successful minister of the Gospel, and we believe that we would act sinfully and impolitically, if we excluded from the ministry all who have not gone through the routine of a collegiate education. For it is a well-known fact that many such, and they, too, ministers in the Presbyterian Church, are lamentably deficient in a knowledge of the dead languages. And, pray, what is the difference betwixt the man who has so superficially studied a language that he does not understand it, and one who makes no pretensions to such a knowledge? The only difference we can perceive is, that the one passes for what he is, and the other for what he is not.

It appears that the Doctor has learned that our disorders, (we presume he alludes to our 'wild, revolting, fanatical irregularities,') are not so extensive now as formerly. There he is mistaken, for we believe that they were much more extensive last year than ever before, as upwards of ten thousand souls professed to be converted in the bounds of our operations, and the most of them at those meetings of ours at which, Dr. Bishop says, our people met to 'talk, and leap, and shout, and exhort, and dispute.'

While on this subject, we deem it due to truth to say that when, on a former occasion, we stated that we knew of no "wild, revolting, fanatical irregularities" practiced among our people, we were mistaken. We are sorry to say, that

since that time we have heard of some practices which can go by no other name, but we hold that our body is not to blame for them. That all may judge correctly of the nature of these disorders, we will here give one instance, that the like may never occur again :

In the early part of this century, Rev. Joshua L. Wilson, that friend of order and orthodoxy, at a meeting at Shiloh, in the public congregation, clapped his hands, screamed aloud, and closed the scene by falling into the arms of one of the young men, who was afterwards tried by him and others who sat as a Commission of Synod, and condemned for his disorderly practices. What induced that standard of order and orthodoxy to be guilty of such a 'wild, revolting, fanatical irregularity,' we know not, but charitably hope that the poor man was at the time laboring under the influence of a "morbid excitement." If the Doctor has forgotten the circumstances, we know who can refresh his memory. Meanwhile, we advise him and all the other D.D.'s, who have so frequently used harsh terms, and applied abusive epithets to the Cumberland Presbyterians, hereafter to take the beam out of their own eye, and then they will see more clearly to take the mote out of their neighbor's.

To our brethren, we say, in this discussion, we have confined ourselves chiefly to the testimony of the Presbyterian Church, drawn from the minutes of her judicatories concerned, and letters from some of her members. These fully clear us of the charges made against us by Dr. Miller and others. But we are in possession of important testimony afforded by eye-witnesses belonging to our own denomination, which we have not yet published, but which will be useful in preparing the history of our church which we expect shortly to publish."

And so ended this polemic, more creditably to the hearts of the combatants than usually happens in such affairs. I find no allusion to the matter in the following volumes of the *Cumberland Presbyterian*. Recalling a few facts by way of comment will enable my readers to appreciate this subject in all its bearings.

Well has the Apostle James given the warning: "Behold

how great a matter a little fire kindleth ;" and this applies no less to the pen than the tongue. The pen is merely the tongue multiplied, and sometimes a million fold. Men in eminent position, representative men, must be careful how they point a moral and adorn a tale. Unwittingly they may bear false witness against their neighbor, which no subsequent retractions can efface. Dr. Miller, in 1833, occupied an eminent position, like that of Professor Hodge or President McCosh, of this day. As early as 1805, his *Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century*, had won the applause of two hemispheres. He was the Professor of Ecclesiastical History and Church Government in the oldest and principal Theological Seminary of the Presbyterians in America. In England and Scotland, in Ireland and Canada, throughout the United States, and in Australia, wherever the English tongue is spoken, his testimony on just such points, as he incidentally introduced about Cumberland Presbyterians, in a letter on so popular a subject as revivals, would be received as literal truth. And the more readily, because of his peculiarly admirable personal qualities, of which Dr. Allibone, (Episcopalian) says, "when chilled by the cold, repulsive, distant manners that sometimes disgust us in walking statues, clerical and lay, we can warm our hearts at our memories by recalling the cordial, affectionate winning address of the good Dr. Miller, at whose approach every eye brightened, and of whom, at his departure, every tongue was loud in praise." Such a man bearing such testimony as he did, it need not excite surprise that the only and semi-official journal of the Church misrepresented, should pursue the matter to at least a well-intended adjustment.

Smith, Miller, Ewing, strong men and good, really differed but little. Now they are at one in the General Assembly of the saints, and even when thus, laboriously striving with the pen to reach at least unity of heart, they were far nearer together than they seemed to be, or were themselves conscious. Smith and Miller both died, as they had for years lived together, fellow-members of the strictest branch of the Presbyterian family. Could Ewing and Miller have known each other personally, they were endowed with just such con-

trasted excellencies by nature and by grace, as would have cemented a strong and lasting friendship. How would the Western Evangelist have admired the grace and polish, the Christian gentleness of the renowned theological professor. With what humility and child-like eagerness for knowledge would he have availed himself of the rich and varied stores of learning, ever-ready to flow from Dr. Miller's tongue. On the other hand, the man from the sea-coast and the city, how quickly would he have fallen in love with the symmetrical and nobly-rounded character of the majestic pioneer preacher, who was foremost and persevering in the advocacy of every Christian cause, who preached emancipation before the abolitionists were heard of, and practised his preaching, not by attempting to abolish the properties of others at a distince, in violation of plighted compacts, but by stripping himself of large and valuable slave-property.

I cannot pass on without correcting a very important error in Dr. Miller's letters above given, which editor Smith does not notice; perhaps for want of space, or it may be that its scope and bearing did not then attract his attention as it now does mine. Among the facts which the Doctor considered firmly established by his inquiries, number four reads, "That the irregular men, thus ejected, proceeded to form a new body under the name of Cumberland Presbyterians," etc. Any one, from this language, would infer that as in the case of the Free Church in Scotland, or of the Constitutional (New School) Presbyterian Church in the United States, or of quite a number of other Presbyterian Churches, and other Churches not Presbyterian, a controversy arising in times of excitement, no matter about what, had at length resulted in the sharp, incisive, decisive, offensive, and permanent, organization of a new body. Now, precisely that which marks and distinguishes the origin of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in ecclesiastical annals, is that its record is so strikingly, so patiently, so persistently, the opposite. The *ipso facto-ing*, was ordered by the Kentucky Synod in October, 1805. The commission carried it into effect in December, 1805. The unhoused pastors, evangelists, licentiates, and candidates, took refuge for a season in a "Council," and abstained from Presbyterial acts

purposely that the door might be left open for a brotherly reconciliation. Time and again they sent messages and letters to the distant General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, showing, beyond contradiction, the depth and warmth of their *filial attachment* to that Church. The machinery of the judicatories, however, moved slowly; the scattered sheep were not fed, their own souls were wearied with a sense of homelessness, and after five long years, they organized simply *one* Presbytery. The new modelling of the Confession of Faith they still deferred.

Three obscure, devout, and devoted Presbyterian ministers in the then remote and unappreciated wilds of the central West, with fastings and prayers, with sorrow of heart and deep longings for the communion of the holy Catholic Church, and with unaffected respect and esteem for that noble and resplendent branch from which they were about organically to separate themselves, founded the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, simply and solely that they might have standing-room to do the Master's work. No stormy debates nerved their purpose. No crowds of devoted and admiring co-presbyters urged them on to immediate and telling action. No multitudes of eager followers bade them stand fast. No busy world stood by to applaud their pluck and resolution. Literally they were alone with God. The solemn realities of eternity were before them. The temporal and everlasting welfare of families, friends, and neighbors, at stake. They sought for wisdom from him who hath promised it to those who wait upon him. They went straight on in the line of duty. They did right. They were blessed.

It may safely be affirmed, and with emphasis, that in the annals of Church history we nowhere find an origin so unschismatic and so unsectarian.

In May, 1866, I was an earnest and deeply interested, though silent, member of the General Assembly of the Old School Presbyterian Church, which met in St. Louis. On several accounts this will always be considered a marked session of that great Church court. Efficient steps were taken towards healing the bitter schism which nearly thirty years before was consummated in Philadelphia. On the other hand, long

and stormy debates resulted in such action as to intensify the separation between this body and the Assembly which had originated in the Southern States during the Civil War. The contest culminated upon the course to be taken with the Louisville Presbytery, represented upon the floor by Rev. Dr. S. R. Wilson (son of Joshua L. Wilson), and Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson. The former Moderators, Rev. Dr. H. A. Boardman, of Philadelphia, Rev. Dr. Wm. L. Breckinridge, of Missouri, and Rev. Dr. E. P. Humphrey, of Louisville, made long and elaborate arguments, and were heard with great respect. The latter, especially, held the large Assembly and crowded church in rapt and eager attention, by a close, logical, and powerful argument, spoken with the earnest eloquence of deep feeling, in which he dwelt with happy appropriateness upon the peculiarly eventful and stormy history of Presbyterianism in Kentucky. All in vain; the stern and unrelenting majority went right on in their course. The Presbytery of Louisville was dissolved in a remarkable way, which has passed into the Annals of the American Presbyterian Church as the famous *Ipso facto* proceedings of 1866. Thereupon at once arose a great debate within the limits of Kentucky, resulting in two Synods, one standing by the Assembly, the other independent; in fact, *Kentucky Presbyterians*. Here, on a larger scale, a more extensive theater, and with far more violence of controversy, was repeated the drama of 1805. If in 1866, the General Assembly was harsh, unjust, and un-Presbyterian in its treatment of the leading Presbytery connected with the Synod of Kentucky, I cannot see how we can avoid giving the verdict that in 1805 the Synod of Kentucky was equally so in its treatment of Cumberland Presbytery. "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured to you," is the Master's warning.

In March, 1875, it was my privilege to be present at a called meeting of the clergy of Nashville, attended by representative and working ministers from the Baptist, Methodist, Presbyterian, and Cumberland Presbyterian Churches. Rev. T. A. Hoyt, pastor of the First Presbyterian church, read a letter from the Rev. Dr. Stuart Robinson, pastor of the Second Presbyterian church, Louisville, recommending in strong

terms, the ministrations of the celebrated lay-evangelists, Messrs. Whittle and Bliss. These gentlemen were accordingly invited to Nashville, where their efforts were heartily seconded by the evangelical clergy and people, and apparently highly blessed of God. None were more hearty, earnest, efficient, in aiding and defending this work, than the accomplished and faithful pastors of the different Presbyterian churches in the city and neighborhood. For full four weeks immense crowds waited upon and enjoyed the services of unlicensed, unordained men. No questions were raised as to whether or no these earnest revivalists were trained in the ancient languages of the Holy Scriptures; or as to exactly how much of our different, but not widely divergent Confessions of Faith they subscribed. All felt that a remarkable and peculiar work was being carried on in accordance with the gospel scheme. None were disposed, by unseasonable cavil, to mar that work.

Now, then, if from 1800 to 1805, the members of the Synod of Kentucky had any occasion to find fault with the revival majority of Cumberland Presbytery, and complain of their measures as irregular and disorderly, because, under strict Presbyterial supervision and authority, they allowed gifted young men to preach the glad tidings of salvation; and, if in consequence of these fault-findings, eminent divines in the Presbyterian Church have reiterated these epithets, "irregular and disorderly," shall we not say that 1875 has removed all cause of controversy? Has not the little finger of the Synod of Kentucky, in the persons of the wealthy, learned, powerful ministers and members of the Louisville and Nashville churches, the lineal and spiritual descendants of the Synod of 1805, in this very year of grace and salvation from the Lord, been thicker than the loins of the poor Cumberland Presbytery of that day? How would the glorified souls of McGready and Hodge, of McGee and Ewing, and of their thousands of co-workers, magnify the Lord, if it be given them to know of the strange and beautiful reconciliation happening within the third generation after, and upon the very scenes of their labors and trials!

ART. II.—*Religion and Modern Science.*

BETWEEN religion and science there is a very close alliance. Both have the same source and the same destination. They resemble two streams issuing from the same mountain side, and, for a time, flowing parallel, until at length they mingle their waters into one. The attempt to oppose their testimony never has succeeded, never can succeed. When their testimony is clearly interpreted, they are found to witness to the God of truth, and to the truth of God. We say that science is thought—systematized thought about the objects with which it is concerned. True; but who made the objects thought about, the objects which make scientific thought possible? Are not the thoughts of the scientist, when they are true thoughts, the thoughts of God? A child looks at an intricate piece of machinery, but sees no meaning, no plan, no purpose, in the movement of its wheels. In this way many look upon nature. The scientist seeks to discover the laws by which the movements of nature are regulated and governed. But who established these laws? Of whose thought are they the embodiment? It is a poor philosophy that shuts God out of nature. What are the laws of nature but the ascertained methods in which God works? We look through nature's laws up to nature's Law-giver. The old Jews had loftier conceptions of nature than many of our modern men of science, for, instead of ascribing what they saw around them to blind law, they traced it directly to a living, personal God.

Theologians have been blamed, and sometimes not without reason, for their tardiness in accepting the discoveries of science. Gladly ought they to accept truth from any quarter, for no single truth conflicts with any other truth. But since much of what is presented for truth, is only conjecture, care must be taken to winnow the chaff from the wheat. It cannot be denied that in the region of scientific research there is a great dearth of positive truth. We have instead a huge bundle of negatives. We ask for bread and are offered a

stone. Nor is this lack of positive truth always deplored. Doubt is considered the highest virtue. Reason is exalted above faith. Unquestioning belief in the "lively oracles" of God is treated as a pitiable weakness. A richer mine of gold than that found in the Bible has been promised, but the specimens given are poor enough—scarcely worth the smelting. Many difficulties which preclude our acceptance of the opinions of the advanced thinkers of this age are honestly admitted to be unsolved. Materialism has been baffled to account for thought and feeling as qualities of the brain—a physical cause being inadequate to produce spiritual effects. The common germ of Darwin, from which all living creatures are assumed to have sprung, has yet to be discovered, and, if discovered, would have to be accounted for. In the evolution theory, many missing links have to be supplied before the chain of evidence is complete. There are great gulfs fixed over which none can pass.

Professor Huxley has been forced to admit that the doctrine of spontaneous generation has not been proved. Sir William Thomson while expressing himself deeply impressed by Professor Huxley's frank confession, adds, "I am ready to adopt as an article of scientific faith, true, through all space, and through all time, that life proceeds from life, and from nothing but life."

To say that force is the origin of life is simply to shift the difficulty a little further back. Force, *unless governed by intelligence*, constructs nothing. How, then, can it originate life? The "force theory" is a lame attempt to destroy human accountability by reducing man to a mere automaton, and to rule God out of his universe by dispensing with his services as a Creator. The only true philosophy is that which makes supreme, uncreated will the source of all force throughout the universe—including, of course, living force, or life.

Scientific men are, themselves, at war with each other. The findings of the geologist jar with the findings of the astronomer. And even those who follow out the same investigations disagree in their theories. Sir Charles Lyell, for instance, asserts that a certain field of peat has been seven

thousand years in course of formation. Another geologist of his own school says, "I think it quite possible that it has only been seven hundred years in growing." A bit of pottery is dug up in the Nile Valley, and it is agreed that it must have been there for twenty thousand years. A closer examination reveals marks which prove it to be to be less than two thousand years old. According to the estimate of Sir C. Lyell, the delta of the Mississippi has taken one hundred thousand years in its formation, but a closer investigation shows that the inference is unwarrantable, and that no more than four thousand years are required to account for its existence. At one time it was believed that animal life could not exist in the sea at a greater depth than three hundred fathoms. By later experiments it has been discovered at two thousand four hundred and thirty-five fathoms. For a time it was thought that the granite rock was igneous, and that it formed one of the lowest strata of "a cooling globe;" now it is regarded as a sedimentary rock of recent formation. Until recently the nebulae were believed to be worlds passing from a gaseous state to a state of solidification. One look through Lord Rosse's large telescope swept away the "Nebular Hypothesis" of La Place, by revealing the nebulae as myriads of small but distinct stars. Up to a recent date, it was supposed that the chalk formation contained the remains of species of creatures which had been extinct for ages, and from this supposed fact an inference was drawn in favor of the world's great age, but lo! the deep sea dredgings have fished up these "extinct" creatures from the bottom of the ocean, and thus the old theory of the chalk formation has broken down, and along with it the theory of the earth's age. These examples of hasty generalization show that many of the scientific theories afloat are simply "probable guesses." They are not supported by a careful induction of facts. There is much need "to make haste slowly," in the general deductions of natural science. All well authenticated facts ought to be accepted by religion, or so much the worse for religion. But while the facts are accepted, the theories based upon them may be questioned or rejected. In the meantime, until scientists complete the investigation of existing phe-

nomena, settle their own differences, and arrive at a unanimous conclusion, what is the theologian to do? Is he to accept as truth these conjectures, which are bandied about, and set aside the "sure word of testimony?" No! rather let him hold that word with a tighter grasp. It is his sheet anchor in every storm of controversy. Some of his own interpretations he may have to widen, so that they may embrace the truths of science, but the word itself will require no change. All truth being one, no truth in any other sphere can possibly war with the truth of revelation.

In investigating the worth of scientific discovery, we have to consider the comparative value of knowledge. All knowledge is not equally important. And yet many naturalists spend more time in the study of an insect, than in the study of God. What folly! Untiring industry, worthy of a nobler object, is expended upon trifles. The object so ardently pursued is sometimes quite as useless as that of Prince Bonbennon, in Goldsmith's "Citizen of the World," who traveled to see a white mouse with green eyes. While saying this, we are very far from undervaluing the splendid achievements of science. To it religion owes a large debt of gratitude, since it has corrected many grave and foolish errors, and given us more exalted views of the being and character of God. It has likewise given us greater control over the wild forces of nature, enabling us to tame them, and make them our servants; and in helping forward the cause of civilization, it has helped on the cause of religion. There is, however, much that lies beyond its province. It can tell us how to curb the forces of nature, but it cannot tell us how to curb our evil passions. It can tell us how to heal disease, but the diseases of the soul lie beyond its power. For them it has no remedy. The heart's sorrows it cannot lighten. No way can it show whereby the soul's guilt can be absolved. Tell the sin-burdened soul of the inflexible rigor with which nature avenges herself upon every violator of her laws, and he is driven to despair. There is no gospel in such teaching. We do not say that there is no gospel in nature. Far from it. In nature there is more than the reign of law: there is the reign of love, for there is the reign of God, and

"God is love." But this many of our modern *savans* have failed to discover.

Still, even if science were to give full emphasis to the gospel of nature, there is something more required. Science can never successfully occupy the place of religion. Religion has a place peculiarly her own. "The first desire of the heart," says Buckle, in his "History of Civilization," "is something on which to lean." This deep and universal desire is never met until man is led by religion to a personal God—a living, loving Saviour—as the heart's fixed center. It is well to inquire what these materialists are prepared to give us in place of that blessed Christianity of which they seek to rob us. We press them for an answer, but they are mute. They pull down, but cannot build up. Their work is destructive, not constructive. We wander in utter hopelessness through their desolate earth, seeking rest and finding none. Like Mary, we go to the grave of a buried Redeemer, and say: They have taken away my Lord, and what have I more? My light is extinguished; my hope has fled; my foundations have been dissolved, and what have I left? I look to the heavens but they are silent; the Father's voice is no longer heard; the open gate of glory is no longer seen; no longer do the stars wheel in space

Forever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is divine!

The world is cheerless and dark, for no longer is it the habitation of God; its struggles are meaningless; its hard problems remain unsolved. The whole of life is a bitter mockery, and the earth one mighty grave in which even that which men dreamed to be immortal, is buried.

From this gloomy prospect the soul of man instinctively recoils. We need something that can afford strength and comfort for the toils and trials of the present; something that can illumine the future with hope. Every cry of human weakness, want, and sorrow, is a cry after God. Man is a religious being; a religion of some kind, a God of some kind, he must have. If not Christianity, if not "Christ the Christian's God," what then? That is the practical and vital question at issue. And until it be satisfactorily settled, is it

not wise, is it not safe, to stake our eternal all upon the Christ of Christianity, in whom alone has been found the only sure hope, the only satisfying rest, for sinful, sorrowing mortals?

ART. III.—*Creation of Living Bodies.*

THE advancement of modern science has aroused a fear in the mind of many believers in a revealed religion, that ere long the Bible will be classed as a book of fiction, and that their faith will be left without a foundation. Many learned men have already denounced the Bible as false, and they are exhausting every means to impress upon the world the belief in no other God than the physical forces of nature. True science is, in itself, undeniable, and it is sure destruction to any religious creed to endeavor to march blindly over its teachings. It is just as atheistic in principle for the believers in revelation to deny a scientific truth, as it is for the materialist to deny the Bible; for one is the Creator's written word, and the other is the stamp of his finger upon nature's tablets.

It is as useless to attempt to disprove the *works* of God, as it is illusive to endeavor to impeach his *word*. The great mistake in the religious world has been, that its greatest men have not consulted the book of Nature in seeking a knowledge of its Author, and have thus been taunted and perplexed by theories claiming to be truly scientific, but which are only opinions without clear demonstration. Let theologians turn their attention more to scientific investigation, and the good results will soon manifest themselves in peace and harmony between religion and science. In this age of the world, it must not be expected that the broad fields of science will remain unexplored. Man's restless mind is ever seeking to explain the mysteries by which he is surrounded, and as long as his investigations lead to truth, surely no mor-

tal should offer a resisting hand. Then let the future strife be between *true* and *false* science, instead of between religion and science.

This brings us to the point at which we will begin to discuss, in a brief manner, the origin of living bodies, and, in doing so, we wish to lay aside all religious scruples. The subject must be divided into two heads; viz.: origin of life, and origin of form or type. In the first place, we must investigate the principle of life. Living matter, according to the materialistic idea, originated from the action of the physical forces, heat, light, electricity, etc., upon the inorganic matter of which our planet is composed. Materialists claim that in the earliest ages of the earth's existence, these physical forces were the only forms of force; and by the correlation of these, the other higher forms of force, such as chemical, vital, and even mental, have originated. This is the theory without demonstration.

When the chemist brings two elements into relation under such circumstances as to cause them to unite and produce a compound, he does not create the peculiar power by which that combination takes place; he only develops the activity of a force already existing. This is called chemical force or affinity. If, in the act of union, this chemical force be produced, why is he not able to make *any* two elements combine? If chemical force is developed by the correlation of the physical forces, it would be reasonable to suppose that the chemist would be able to produce any desired compound; but we know there are elements that cannot be united under any physical circumstances. This fact, we claim, is explained by attributing to chemical force, a higher origin than the inferior physical forces; and, in order for elementary bodies to combine, there must *previously* exist in them the power by which that combination is to take place.

Now, we come to vital force, which is as much superior to chemical force as the latter is to the physical forces. Can false science teach us that it, too, originated primarily from the physical forces, by correlation? Can the combined action of the chemical and physical forces produce such a powerful result? No; not even when aided by all the ingenuity of

man's mind, has any such result been obtained. It has been the great object of many scientific minds to so operate upon inorganic matter, by chemical and physical means, as to produce a living germ; but, as yet, all such men have gone to their graves with unrealized hopes, and left their useless efforts as the strongest evidence of a Creator of all things.

But the chemist is not alone in these attempts. Physiologists have brought forward the theory of "spontaneous generation" to frighten the religious world. When they observed animalculæ appearing in places where no parents were found, they at once, without proper investigation, concluded that living matter could be produced spontaneously; but when closer investigation had been made, it was found that these places had been visited by insects to deposit their ova, from which these animalculæ were developed. Decaying animal and vegetable matter, when exposed to certain degrees of heat and moisture, will almost invariably swarm with microscopic life. From whence came this life, if it was not from the effect of the physical forces of heat, light, etc., upon the dead matter? It is now known that the atmosphere is at all times impregnated with living germs, and that these are developed into organic forms under certain influences. How easy is it for these germs to be caught by decaying matter, in which they find the conditions under which their development will take place! Besides, as we have before stated, insects may visit this matter and deposit their eggs. These facts have been established by the repeated observation of many careful investigators, and are now acknowledged by the former supporters of the false theory of "spontaneous generation." It is useless to enter into any discussion in reference to the means by which these facts were made known. They are now established and cannot be refuted.

What, then, must we conclude, was the origin of life force? We claim that it and all other forms of force, are *independent creations* of the divine Mind. Now let us look at the theory of Prof. La Conte on this subject, and see if it is not more consistent with the observations of true science, than that which denies the working of a higher power in the creation

of life. He has supposed all matter to be arranged on four planes of existence.

First, is the plane of the *elementary matter* of which our planet is composed.

Second, the plane of *chemical compounds*.

Third, the plane of *vegetable life*, and

Fourth, the plane of *animal life*.

Now, matter is taken from the first or lowest station and gradually raised to the fourth or highest, but in the process it passes, successively, through the intermediate stations. How is this work performed? Elementary matter cannot be united into chemical compounds, except through the influence of chemical force, it must then be acted upon by vegetable life-force, in order to be appropriated to the use of vegetables, and lastly, animal life-force elevates it to the plane of animal life. It will be seen that there must previously exist a certain kind of force to raise matter from one of these planes to the next higher. Where did it originate? Our answer is, it originated in the beginning, from the great Source of all power both in heaven and on earth.

Now let us consider the second principle involved in the creation of living bodies, viz., that of

TYPE OR FORM.

In viewing the minute anatomical structure of organic bodies, either in the vegetable or animal kingdom, we are impressed with the idea of the existence of a Supreme Power, by which such architectural beauty and strength could be imparted to objects of such small dimensions. If we have a God to create the power or force to perform the work of raising inorganic matter into an organic form, does not the same God direct and control that work? Do not the works of nature themselves teach us that they are fresh from the hands of a creator? Design is manifested in every object, showing the power of thought, and that of a nature far superior to the capacity of a finite mind.

But we are told by men of science that all organic bodies, both vegetable and animal, have resulted from the action of the physical forces upon inorganic matter. This theory of

"evolution" is attracting much attention at the present time, and if established, would overthrow the Christian religion. According to its teachings, it is only necessary that we should be able to account for the creation of one living germ in some remote age of the earth's history, and from this the various types and forms have been evolved through physical agencies acting under different circumstances as regards moisture, etc.

Were we to consider this subject with the view of the origin of life set forth above, there would be no room for argument, for then the very foundation of the materialistic structure would be destroyed. Then, for the sake of investigation, the physical production of a living germ will be admitted, and we will begin with the lowest substance possessing vitality. This substance is the same, physically, for the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and has received different names by different observers, some calling it Protoplasm, some Blastema, and others, germinal matter. Yet, by all, it is acknowledged to be of the same physical structure wherever found. Under the most powerful microscope, it appears as a homogeneous mass of matter, no trace of organization having ever been detected, and yet it manifests vitality. This, then, is a substance capable of organization. How is its development brought about? As far as an increase in size, or growth is concerned, the material is undoubtedly appropriated from the external world, and its vital force determines that growth. Were it dead, it would not grow. Now, if we take two specimens of this Blastema, and expose them to the same physical influences, what would be the result, if all Blastema is identical in composition? According to "evolution" there would be two organisms, of exactly the same type produced, and such, we must acknowledge, would be the case, were there no other agency, than the physical forces, at work in their development. But, do we actually have identical types always occurring under identical circumstances, as regards the physical world? No, we see exactly similar types and forms springing up, under the most diverse circumstances, and different types produced under identical circumstances. Knowing the homogeneous character of

Blastema, and acknowledging the eternal relation of cause and effect, it would, on first inspection, seem incredible that these results are obtained; but our perplexity arises from the fact that we have not taken into consideration another agency in this work. Although no physical or chemical differences, in different specimens of this first organizable substance, can be detected by any power of man, there must be some unseen agency to produce these different results. We assert that there is a morphological agency to control the development of organic forms, and that this agency is the stamp of a creative mind upon the vital force inherent in each portion of Blastema. The vital force belonging to each specimen of Blastema has a stamp of its own, and it matters not under what physical circumstances that substance be placed, (provided those circumstances are favorable to its development), no other form than that over which its vital force has control will result. It matters not how much cultivated by the science of man, its development will result in the production of a type of organization representative of its own vital force. What physical influences could ever so control the development of a germ of wheat, as to produce a grain of rice?

This subject admits of a very simple and impressive illustration in the building of any human machine; take for instance, a steam engine. On examination, we see an immense amount of work was expended, and that work was guided by thought. Had the crude material of which it was constructed merely been acted upon by the physical forces, and the muscular power of man, without the guiding influence of his mind, no such machine would have been produced. So in the animal and vegetable worlds, the material is not merely worked upon by physical means, the vital force so directs and controls the work as to develop the germ into a certain type of body.

ART. IV.—*The Doctrine of Causes.*

HAVE the forces of nature, as they are called, been always at work? Is the material universe an effect of some great uncaused cause? Or, has it taken its place on the map of existence without any cause back of itself? We exist; how did we get into being? Are we effects of a cause superior to ourselves? or, are we the originators of our own existence? Is the knowing, feeling, willing entity in man, which we call mind, an effect? or, has that spiritual and invisible entity, of which every rational being is conscious, come into existence without an adequate cause, a cause independent of us, above us, and before us?

Is there an infinite, intelligent, uncaused, personal God, who has given existence to, who sustains, who rules over, and governs all matter and all mind? If there is such a being, above all and before all, and infinitely superior to all, and absolutely independent of all, is it possible for him to reveal his existence and his attributes to his creatures? Is it possible for him to give existence to beings who could, and who would, in their turn, be originating powers? Has he given existence to beings who are causes, first causes, conscious first causes of effects? Have we any evidence that such is actually the case? These, and a multitude of questions such as these, come rushing into every reflecting mind when the doctrine of causes is presented before us.

Indeed, all who are even partially acquainted with the writing of the leading thinkers of our age, know that this is the very field where the battle between theism on the one side, and atheism on the other, is being fought. It is the battle ground where the friends and the foes of the miraculous, and the supernatural are at issue. With respect to the ultimate results of the contest, we have no fear; for truth is mighty, it will, it must prevail; and all the false systems, speculations and theories of men, whether they relate to the physical, the metaphysical, or the moral, must give place to the onward march of light and knowledge.

La Mettrie, a French materialist, for instance, pronounced the belief in the existence of a God to be as groundless as it was unprofitable. Not many years ago, at a students' congress in Liege, some of the speakers declared, amidst universal applause, that their aim was to do away with all religion, to destroy all churches, and to eradicate every thought of God from the consciences of their fellow men, and that, in their opinion, atheism was the ultimate aim of all human science. Dr. Christlieb, in his excellent work on "Modern Doubt and Christian Belief," furnishes us with a considerable amount of valuable information on this subject. He says, "The controversy as to the idea of God, is no longer the same as it was a hundred or two hundred years ago. At that time, if we except a few pantheists, the existence of a personal God was not generally called in question, and hence the only disputed point was God's action in the world; whether he could work miracles, whether his providence extended to all things, whether Christ was truly divine, and the like. In the present day, however, it is not merely this that is called in question, but also the existence of God at all; and, consequently, the existence of the human spirit as a distinct essence. Formerly, the issue lay between Biblical Christianity and Deism. Now, it lies between Christianity and—nothing, between belief in God as the personal Spirit who is Love, and the denial of God, which must be the annihilation of man's spiritual and moral being." (Page 137.)

The question then at issue resolves itself into this: Are we to believe in the theories of a pantheistic materialism, or in the personal God of the Bible? In other words, are we to believe in effects without an adequate cause, or, in an intelligent, necessary being, who has given being to, and who sustains all matter and all mind? Is what we see around about us, and beneath us, and above us, and within us, the product of nature? Did nature make nature, or has nature a maker? The atheist furnishes us with his answer to the question, "Nature, by its combination, produces suns, which place themselves in the center of so many systems; she forms planets, which, by their peculiar essence, gravitate, and describe their revolutions around these suns; by degrees the

motion is changed altogether, and becomes eccentric; perhaps the day may arrive when these wondrous masses will disperse, of which man, in the short space of his existence, can only have a faint and transient glimpse."

The extract which we have just given is taken from "Lectures on the Atheistic Controversy," by Godwin, in which that writer, fairly, logically, and triumphantly, refutes the atheist. We quote the following from his excellent book. In speaking of the origination of all forms, and all life as being attributed by the atheist solely to motion, he says: "If, then, motion produces all things, motion must have been before all things, as that which produces must be antecedent to that which is produced. It must be also assumed that it is eternal, for, if motion commenced at any period, it must have had a cause. To suppose that matter, after an eternal quiescence, originated motion, is an absurdity which cannot be entertained: it must, then, if it ever commenced, have had a cause extraneous to matter, and if that which produces all things but itself, was itself produced by a power superior to matter, and controlling it at pleasure, we arrive again at the idea of a supreme and eternal creator." (Page 72.)

Those who deny the existence of an intelligent, personal, infinite, uncaused Being, whom we call God, admit what logically leads to a demonstration of the very truth which they deny. (See Gillespie's Argument, *a priori*.)

They admit that we have not a necessary existence; they admit that matter has not a necessary existence; they admit that the universe is not absolutely infinite; they admit that change is possible, that motion and development are visible. They admit that matter is divisible, and by this last admission alone they deprive it of a necessary existence. Now, if it has not a necessary existence, it must be an effect, and if it be an effect, it must have a cause, and that cause must, in the very nature of things, be an intelligent cause.

Atheists have also admitted that space is infinite, and they have admitted that duration is infinite. Such admis-

sions, in connection with the fact that matter is divisible, consequently, not necessary, and that we, ourselves, have not a necessary existence, have an important bearing on the doctrine of causes. If simple extension, or, as John Locke expresses it, "pure space," that is to say, expansion, be infinite, and we cannot even conceive of its limitation, then it follows as a necessary consequence, that pure space, or expansion is necessary. It is not an effect, for it is absolutely infinite, and being infinite, it could not, in the nature of things, any more than duration, be brought into being. We venture the assertion, that no man who thinks out his thoughts on this subject, can help believing that expansion, and duration, are infinite, and for that very reason, must be necessary. They are not, therefore, an effect, and it is just as clear and evident that they are not a cause. We cannot conceive of simple extension and duration giving existence to material substances, either organic or inorganic. We cannot conceive of them as giving existence to complete beings like ourselves. We cannot conceive simple extension and duration giving existence to intelligence, or beings possessed of intelligence. But we can conceive of intelligence existing—we know intelligence is. It is, for we, ourselves, are in the possession of intelligence. If we know anything at all, we knew this much. Since then, intelligence is, we are shut up to one of two conclusions, either it always has been, or it began to be. "That it never began to be, is evident in this, that if it began to be, it must have had a cause; for whatever begins to be must have a cause. And the cause of intelligence, must be intelligence, for what is not of intelligence cannot make intelligence begin to be. Now, intelligence being before intelligence began to be, is a contradiction. And this absurdity following from the supposition that intelligence began to be, it is proved, that intelligence never began to be: to-wit, it is of infinite duration." (Gillespie on the Necessary Existence of God. The Russell Edition, page 3.)

The same logical process of reasoning is pursued by Moses Lowman. The following is an abstract of his argument: "All possible existence is either necessary, which must be, and

in its own nature must be, or contingent, which may be or may not be, for in neither case is a contradiction involved.

Some existence is necessary; for, if all existence were contingent, all existence might not be, as well as might be: and that thing which might not be, never could be without some other thing as the prior cause of its existence, since every effect must have a cause. If, therefore, all possible existence were contingent, all existence would be impossible, because the idea or conception of it would be that of an effect without a cause, which involves a contradiction.

Necessary existence must be actual existence, for necessary existence is that which must be, and cannot but be; that is, it is such existence as arises from the nature of the thing itself, and it is an evident contradiction to affirm that necessary existence might not be.

Necessary existence being such as must be and cannot but be, it must be always, and cannot but be always; for to suppose that necessary existence could begin to be, or could cease to be; that is, that a time might be in which necessary existence would not be, involves a contradiction. Therefore, necessary existence is without beginning, and without end; that is, it is eternal. Necessary existence must be wherever any existence is possible; for all existence is either contingent or necessary; all contingent existence is impossible without necessary existence being previously as its cause, and wherever existence is possible, it must be either of a necessary or of a contingent being. Therefore, necessary existence must be wherever existence is possible; that is, it must be infinite. There can be but one necessarily existing being, for two necessarily existing beings could, in no respect whatever, differ from each other; that is, they would be one and the same being." (See First Lines of Christian Theology, by Dr. J. P. Smith.)

It is clear, therefore, that something is, that infinity is, that intelligence is. What then? Simply this: Intelligence supposes a being, a personality, and as infinite expansion, and infinite duration necessarily exist, and as we cannot conceive of either the one or the other being intelligent, or efficient causes, they are, and in the very nature of things, must be, the modes of that infinite, necessary being whom we call God.

One thing is quite clear and evident, as has just been stated, intelligence is—it exists. No man in his senses will, or can, deny this. Well, if intelligence is, it either always has been, or it began to be. Here we must either affirm or deny, there seems to be no alternative. If we deny that intelligence always has been, we plunge into gloomy atheism and absurdity. If, on the other hand, we take the affirmative, we are not only delivered from darkness, and a multitude of perplexing difficulties, but we can, in harmony with the intuitions and yearnings of the mind, and in harmony with the dictates of our reason, rise up through the visible universe to the unseen, uncaused cause of all things.

We know that it is quite possible for a man to deny the existence of a personal God, and refuse to believe that any revelation of his being and attributes has been given. It is quite easy for any man, if he is so disposed, to wish in his heart, or to utter in words the sentiment, There is no God or as Robert Dale Owen in his discussion with Origen Bachelor expressed it, "Nothing upon earth, not my own existence, is more evident to me than this—that if there be an Omnipotent God, it has not been his will that I should know anything about him. How can I be sure of this? Because I know nothing about him."

Before any man can either honestly or satisfactorily arrive at the assurance of faith in the doctrine of atheism as true, he has, as it seems to us, a great many problems to solve, a great many questions to answer, a good many journeys to take, and fields to explore. In speaking of the ignorant and arrogant pretensions of the atheist, John Foster says: "To the atheist there is *nothing* in place of that which is the supremacy of all existence and glory. The divine Spirit, and all spirits, being abolished, he is left amid masses and systems of matter, without a first cause, ruled by chance, or by a blind mechanical impulse which he calls fate; and, as a little composition of atoms, he is himself to take his chance for a few moments of conscious being, and then to be no more forever. And yet in this infinite prostration of all things, he feels an elation of intellectual pride. . . . The wonder then turns on the great process by which a man could

grow to the immense intelligence that can know that there is no God. What ages and what lights are requisite for this attainment! This intelligence involves the very attributes of divinity, while a God is denied. For unless this man is omnipresent, unless he is at this moment in every place in the universe, he cannot know but there may be in some place manifestations of a Deity by which even *he* would be over-powered. If he does not know absolutely every agent in the universe, the one that he does not know may be God. If he is not himself the chief agent in the universe, and does not know what is so, that which is so may be God. If he is not in absolute possession of all the propositions that constitute universal truth, the one which he wants may be that there is a God. If he cannot with certainty assign the cause of all that he perceives to exist, that cause may be a God. If he does not know everything that has been done in the immeasurable ages that are past, something may have been done by a God. Thus, unless he knows all things—that is, precludes another Deity by being one himself—he cannot know that the being whose existence he rejects, does not exist. But he must *know* that he does not exist, else he deserves equal contempt and compassion for the temerity with which he firmly avows his rejection, and acts accordingly. Surely the creature, that thus lifts his voice, and defies all invisible power without the possibilities of infinity, challenging whatever unknown being may hear him, and may appropriate that title of Almighty which is pronounced in scorn, to evince his existence, if he will, by his vengeance, was not as yesterday a little child that would tremble and cry at the approach of a diminutive reptile." (Foster's *Thoughts*: pages 64, 65.)

In short, *to be able to affirm authoritatively that no God exists, a man must be omniscient and omnipresent; that is, he himself must be God*, and then after all there would be one. You see in this the monstrosity of the atheistic hypothesis, that it is possible to prove the non-existence of God. Atheism depends as much, and more, than theism on *faith*; that is, on assumptions which cannot be proved. (See Christlieb on *Atheism*: Lecture Third.)

Many other writers on this great subject have clearly shown that the very arguments which atheists and pantheists employ to get rid of God, and exclude his presence and his influence from his own created universe, only make it more unreasonable and difficult to believe that there is no uncaused first cause. We could easily give a number of quotations in proof of this statement, but the following from Patterson's "Fables of Infidelity and Facts of Faith," will answer our purpose. He says:

"The development theory of the production of the human race from the mud, through the mush-room, the snail, the tortoise, the grayhound, the monkey, and the man, which is now such a favorite with atheists and pantheists, if it were fully proved to be a fact, would only increase the difficulty of getting rid of God. For either the primeval mud had all the germs of the future plants and monkeys, and men's bodies and souls in itself, originally, or it had not. If it had not, where did it get them? If it had all the life and intelligence in the universe in itself, it was a very extraordinary kind of god. We shall call it the *mud-god*. Our pantheists, then, believe in a god of muddy body and intelligent mind. But if they deny intelligence to the mud, then we are back to our original difficulty, with a large appendix, viz.: *The paving-stones made themselves first, and all pantheists and atheists afterward.*

But the whole theory of development is utterly false in its first principles. From the beginning of the world to the present day, no man has ever observed an instance of spontaneous generation. There is no law of nature, whether electric, magnetic, odylic, or any other, which can produce a living plant or animal, save from the germ or seed of some previous plant or animal of the same species. Nor has a single instance of the transmutation of species ever been proved. Every beast, bird, fish, insect, and plant, brought forth after its kind, and has done so since the creation. No law in natural philosophy is more firmly established than this: *There is no spontaneous generation nor transmutation of species.* From Cuvier down, all practical naturalists maintain this law. It is true there is a regular gradation of the various orders of

animal and vegetable life, rising like the steps of a staircase, one above the other; but gradation is no more caused by transmutation, than a staircase is made by an ambitious lower step changing itself into all the upper ones." (Pages 29, 30.)

What evidence have we that there is a great first cause? The book of nature which we see spread out before us, is not only a visible, but it is, we believe, a clear and convincing revelation or manifestation of the power, the wisdom, and the goodness of God. Before looking at the evidence which nature gives us of the existence of a great first cause, and that he is possessed of these attributes in an infinite degree, it may be necessary to state what we mean by *nature*. As words are but the symbols of thought, the incarnation of ideas, it is important to have a clear idea of the term *nature*. There are some writers at the present day who speak a great deal about *nature*, the *course* of nature, the *laws* of nature, the *forces* of nature, etc. They find it a kind of sliding scale by which they can get away from the connection that logically exists between an effect and the cause of that effect. Hence, they often, by the use which they make of the word, virtually shut God out of their thoughts, and as far as they can, out of his own universe. What then do we mean by the word *nature*, when we speak of a great first cause being revealed in *nature*? The visible universe, as we understand it, is just another name for *nature*, so that when we speak of God revealing himself to us in *nature*, we refer to the seen things of creation.

We exist. We assume this much, for we are conscious that we exist, and consciousness is the highest testimony. We see objects around us, and we are as sure that they exist, as we are conscious of our own existence, if we can put any reliance at all upon our senses. But we, though conscious of our existence, have not a necessary existence, we are conscious that we are neither self-made, nor independent. We know also that nature around us has not a necessary existence. We know that it is mutable—that it is subject to change—that it is actually changing, and therefore, in the nature of things cannot be necessary. Mutability cannot be predicated of what has an uncaused or necessary existence, be-

cause this is a palpable contradiction in terms; therefore nature, not being necessary, must have a cause, *and that cause is God.*

We cannot even conceive of what has a necessary existence to exist in any other state or form; but we can easily conceive of matter being either in motion or at rest, and in a multitude of forms and conditions; therefore, its existence is contingent and not necessary. So that whatever is subject to changes of any kind whatever, are just so many pages and paragraphs of that revelation which the uncreated, uncaused cause of all things has given us of his necessary existence.

It is delightful to know that God has revealed himself to us in the polyglot book of nature; and, we may add, it is delightful to know that we are capable of studying his moral character as revealed in, and through his, works. We know that God is. We know when we turn our eyes *out* and *up*, that he exists. We know when we turn our eyes in upon ourselves, and look at our own minds, that he is a *person*. He must be possessed of intelligence, sensibility, and will; for we are possessed of all these. He made us in his own image, after his likeness.

Properly speaking, God is invisible to us, and to all created intelligences. He is a Spirit, and we may either say that he is wrapped up in impenetrable darkness, or surrounded by light so dazzling that he cannot by any possibility be approached even by the highest and holiest of creatures. His essence is, and we have every reason to believe ever will be, invisible to us. The same may, without equivocation or reservation, or hesitation, be said respecting his *attributes*. In themselves considered, they cannot be seen. They are in the true, the proper, and philosophical sense of the expression "*invisible things*." This is not strange or wonderful; for a moment's reflection will convince any man that this is the case with respect to the essence and the attributes of his own mind. But though God is invisible to us, nature, or the material universe, as it exists, is a manifestation, we might almost say a demonstration, of the real existence of his unseen attributes.

All nature is a glass reflecting God,
As by the sea reflected is the sun,
Too glorious to be gazed on in his sphere.

If we examine the works of nature, we shall find, not only that there is a great first cause, but we shall see proof in abundance that the unmade maker of the universe is omnipotent in power. As Paul expresses it, "For the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godhead; so that they are without excuse." (Rom. i. 20.) The power of God is that ability which resides in him—that energy which he has put forth in making, and which he continues to exert in sustaining the visible universe of matter, and the invisible universe of mind. The power of God being an attribute of his nature, is, of course, invisible to us, and yet it is seen, it is clearly seen by us, because revealed, or conspicuously manifested in the visible creation. The sun, the moon, the multitude of stars, and all the millions upon millions of worlds that cluster around those stars, and constitute the splendid and stupendous fabric of the universe are just so many witnesses of the great first cause. They are just so many tongues to tell us of the power of God, his infinite power. We shall not presume to enter into a field so vast as that which here opens up before us. We shall not attempt to rise up among the hosts of heaven, or descend into the yet unfathomed ocean of immensity in search of tangible manifestations of divine power. Let us just look for a few moments at our own earth, and we shall behold ample and overwhelming evidence of the power of God. That our own little world exists is indisputable. To say that it created itself, is to say that there is no distinction between cause and effect, that cause is effect, and effect, cause. To say that it formed or fashioned itself out of chaos, which chaos in its turn made itself out a kind of cloudy haze, or nebula, or fire mist, is to say that there is such a thing as causeless effect, which is simply impossible and absurd. That our world created itself is self-contradictory, that it must have had a maker is self-evident. It is also self-evident that no created being could create our world for the very good reason, that it requires omnipotent energy to call into being the smallest grain of sand on the sea-shore, as

truly as the largest world in existence. It as really requires omnipotence to create the meanest and most insignificant insect, as to create the mightiest archangel. We can only account for the existence of our world, with all that it contains, on the principle that there is an all-powerful being who brought it into existence. "Every house is built by some man; but he that built all things is God." (Heb. iii. 4.) He who is omnipotent in power, brought our world out of its original nothingness, or rolled it from his hand, and he keeps it in motion. As it moves in space, it proclaims as it moves, the boundless and resistless energy of its unmade maker. Josiah Hopkins, in his "Christian Instructor," very justly observes: "When we look at one of our fellow-beings, we see nothing but the operations of a mind or spirit upon the mass of clay. The mind itself, is entirely concealed from our sight, and its effects only are objects of our vision. In all the operations of nature, with equal plainness, we can see the effects of an almighty and intelligent agent." It is evident, then, that the *invisible* power of God is clearly seen in the creation of our world, and that ever since its first formation up to the present hour, his energy, though unseen, is yet clearly seen in the prolongation of its existence. The same power which was required to launch this planet into existence, is required every moment to sustain it in being; and no man who has faith in a personal present God, can doubt the statement, when we affirm that this world, with all its thinking and its thoughtless population, would rush into its original nonentity, were he, for one single hour, to withdraw his sustaining power. If this be the case (and no man but an atheist or pantheist will call it in question), it follows that the creation and continual preservation of our world, are clear and distinct revelations of the presence and the power of a personal God. We may talk about laws doing everything: the law of nature, the law of attraction, the law of repulsion, the law of gravitation, etc., but after all, what is a law, if it is not a rule of action? If it is a rule of action, there must be an *actor*; and if this be so, the laws of the universe, are, after all, just God's method of action. They are instruments and not agents.

This view of the relation of the universe to the living personal God, who is present everywhere as an active agent, has been vindicated, not only by theologians but by philosophers. Such men as Sir Isaac Newton, Clarke, Dugald Stewart, and Herschel, held that all the forces of nature were under the immediate control of an infinite and intelligent agent. Dr. Whewel also takes the same view in his work on *Astronomy and General Physics*. He says: "A law supposes an agent, and a power; for it is the mode according to which the agent proceeds, the order according to which the power acts. Without the presence of such an agent, of such a power, conscious of the relations on which the law depends, producing the effects which the law prescribes, the law can have no efficacy, no existence. Hence we infer that the intelligence by which the law is ordained, the power by which it is put in action, must be present at all times and in all places where the effects of the law occur; that thus the knowledge and the agency of the divine being pervade every portion of the universe, producing all action and passion, all permanence and change. The laws of nature are the laws which he, in his wisdom, prescribes to his own acts; his universal presence is the necessary condition of any course of events, his universal agency the only origin of any efficient force." (See the *Bridgewater Treatise*.)

There is another idea brought before us in *Roman i. 20*, to which we must here refer. Paul not only says that the power of God is seen, and clearly seen, by the things that are made; but (*ἡ τε αὐδίος αὐτοῦ δύναμις*), "even his eternal power" is seen, and clearly seen in the visible creation. Some person might be disposed to say that the existence of our world furnishes us with evidence of the existence of God, seeing that it is not a necessary, but a made thing. It furnishes us with sufficient evidence of the power of God, as well as his existence; but we are at a loss to perceive in the existence of a world that must have recently come into being, any evidence of the eternity of the creator's power. How, it may be asked, can the existence of our world be a proof of the eternal existence of the unseen power of Jehovah? We should not shrink from looking this question right in the face, for there

is no difficulty in the way of giving it a satisfactory answer. We need only to dig a little deeper than the surface, and we shall at once see how this can and must be the case. Let us bear in mind the fact that the world is a thing made; that it is an effect of a cause back of itself; that it owes its existence to a being who must have a necessary existence; that, being an effect, it could not, in the nature of things, be in existence from eternity; not being in existence from eternity, it not only must have been made, and its maker unmade, but that unmade maker must have manifested his eternal power in its creation; for his attributes being essential to his existence, and his existence being necessarily eternal, we come, and we cannot help coming, to the conclusion that every act of creation, whether prior to or after the creation of our world, is a clear and convincing manifestation of his eternal power. Though our world itself, then, has not existed from eternity; though it is but a thing of yesterday when viewed in the light of a past eternity, its very existence on the map of the universe, is a visible manifestation of the eternal existence of that power which gave it existence, seeing that the power of God is essential to his existence, and that existence is necessarily eternal. In other words, since all God's attributes are eternal, and since omnipotence is one of them, every manifestation in his power of creation, and in the very act of creating, must be a manifestation of the eternity of his power.

Let us now look briefly at some of the other attributes of the creator, as they are revealed in nature. The field is, of course, far too extensive to be either explored or traveled over in this article, or even in our present state of existence. Wherever we turn our eyes, however, we see written, as with letters of light, clear and unmistakable evidences of the wisdom and goodness of God, as well as of his power. We see in thousands upon thousands of instances, the best means used to secure the best ends. We see marks of contrivance, skill, foresight, and a simplicity of design in all the parts, in all the relations, and in all the movements of the heavenly bodies. Our own world, as every one knows, revolves at a proper distance from the center of that system of which it

forms a part. It is prevented, on the one hand, from running too near the sun, by a power or influence external to itself, called centrifugal force, and on the other hand, it is kept by a power external to itself, called centripetal force, from running too far away from the genial influence of the sun. It moves, also, on its own axis, from year to year, and from generation to generation. Do we not see the hand of a wise and invisible designer in this? Reason rejects and repudiates the idea that chance is the mother of these movements. Reason repels the idea that chance could construct and put in motion the machinery of the solar system, or any class of globes whatsoever. "Wisdom only is the parent of order, and order the product of wisdom. It cannot be that there should be accurate and continued order by chance. When the letters of the alphabet are put into such an order as to express such and such sense, will any man say this was by chance, and this was without design? especially when this is continued, when they are repeated over and over again, in such order as to make a volume?" (John Howe: Works, p. 1060.)

If Plato called God the "artificer of the world, the maker and father of the universe, the cause of all things," "That which always is, and was never made," "The first God, the greatest God, and the greatest of the gods," surely we can see in every letter, and word, and paragraph, and page of the great book of nature, proofs of the manifold wisdom, as well as mighty power, of the great first cause?

No man was ever led, after a careful examination of the printed page of a newspaper or a book, to deny the existence of a printer; and surely it is far more unreasonable to deny the existence of a wise creator, when there are more proofs of arrangement, design, contrivance, and final cause in nature, than in human art.

Archbishop Tillotson, in one of his sermons, when speaking on this subject, says: "I appeal to any man of reason whether anything can be more unreasonable, than obstinately to impute an effect to chance, which carries, in the very face of it, all the arguments and characters of a wise design and contrivance? Was ever any considerable work, in which

there was required a great variety of parts, and a regular and orderly disposition of those parts, done by chance? Will chance fit means to ends, and that in ten thousand instances, and not fail in one? How often might a man, after he had jumbled a set of letters in a bag, fling them out upon the ground before they would fall into an exact poem, yea, or so much as make a good discourse in prose? And may not a little book be as easily made by chance as this great volume of the world? How long might a man be in sprinkling colors upon a canvass with a careless hand, before they would happen to make the exact picture of a man? And is a man easier made by chance than his picture? How long might twenty thousand blind men, who should be sent out from several remote parts of England, wander up and down before they would all meet upon Salisbury plains, and fall into rank and file in the exact order of an army? And yet this is much more easy to be imagined, than how the innumerable blind parts of matter should rendezvous themselves into a world."

Such men as Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall, tell us that nature and her laws are everything, and that a personal intelligent first cause can be dispensed with. They tell us that dead matter, by some mysterious force which they do not try to explain, can give life to matter, and that it has, in fact, by its own inherent potency, and evolutions, and development, produced what we see in nature, including ourselves. Hear Tyndall, for example, on this point, he says: "Abandoning all disguise, the confession that I feel bound to make before you, is that I prolong the vision backward across the boundary of the experimental evidence, and discern in that matter, which we, in our ignorance, and notwithstanding our professed reverence for its creator, have hitherto covered with opprobrium, the promise and potency of every form and, quality of life." (See his *Inaugural Address*.)

So that, if this doctrine be true, man, with all his noble powers and faculties, must have risen by evolution, up to what he is, not only from the very lowest form of life, but from dead matter itself. The steps may have been multitudinous, and each step upward may have been taken at long,

long intervals of time, but then we must not forget that in a few millions of years, that which has no life, can impart life, and that which has no intelligence, or wisdom, can, and does, impart these attributes!

The effects are wonderful, they are marvelous, they are mighty, and if we bear in mind the fact that the effects are, all the way down the chain of causes and effects, greater each time than the causes that produced them, we shall see what the doctrine is which we are called upon to receive at the hands of our wise scientists, and how implicit our credulity, if we believe it. For, though Professor Tyndall tells us in the same address, that "the doctrine of evolution derives man, in his totality, from the interaction of organism and environment through countless ages past," we have only his word for it. We have no faith in the idea that an effect can be greater than its cause, and as we see numberless displays of wisdom in every page of the book of nature, it is rational to believe that the originating cause of those effects must be infinitely wise.

He is also infinitely good. The goodness of God is that attribute of his nature which disposes him to diffuse happiness throughout the wide extent of his vast dominions. We are so constituted by our creator, that all our senses are inlets to pleasure and enjoyment, and therefore he who gave us our being must be benevolent. His name is love, his nature is love, and all the numberless pages of the great book of nature spread out before us, and above us, tell us in language which cannot be misunderstood, that God is good. As Dr. Dick, in his "Lectures on Theology," beautifully expresses it, "Had not the divine nature been communicative, God would have remained forever alone; but now he beholds from his throne a scale of beings ascending from the insect and the worm, to the seraph and the archangel, all rejoicing in conscious existence, and partaking of the riches of his liberality. The eternal fountain has overflowed, and the universe is refreshed and gladdened by its stream. It is the saying of a heathen philosopher, that when God was about to make the world, he transformed himself into love." (Vol. I., p. 446.)

It seems strange that any man should ever be so foolish as

to think in his heart that there is no God; or that chance could build the world, and fill it with organic and inorganic wonders. The idea that chance itself, in its essence a nonentity, should give existence to all the entities that exist, is too much for our faith. We cannot entertain the idea for a moment. If chance could do wonders so great and so magnificent in ages past, as those which are virtually ascribed to it by its atheistical admirers and worshipers, why do we not see it working wonders still? If it could, for example, fashion and put in motion every wheel of that machine called the solar system; if it could build, or rear a temple so vast, so beautiful, so magnificent, as the universe, why do we not behold it doing wonders now? How does it happen that we never see chance producing on a small scale, what some men tell us it has produced on a large scale? We never saw chance making chairs, or tables, or teacups, or boots, or shoes. We never saw chance building ships or steamboats. We do not see chance building villages, or towns, or cities. We do not see it making railroads from one part of the country to another, for the convenience and accommodation of the community. We never heard any one say that chance could make watches, stereoscopes, microscopes, telescopes, or steam-engines. Is it easier to make such instruments than to make the flowers of the field, the fish of the sea, or the worms, that live, and move, and have their being beneath our feet? To tell us that chance brought nature, or what we see in nature, into existence, is tantamount to saying that nothing made everything, and that what never had any existence, has displayed great power, great wisdom, great goodness, and infinite intelligence, in rearing the magnificent universe!

No wonder that Lord Bacon, in his "Essay on Atheism," says: "I had rather believe all the fables in the legends and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind. And therefore God never wrought a miracle to convince atheism, because his ordinary works convince it." "'Tis well known," says Sir Isaac Newton, "that the supreme God exists of necessity; and by the same necessity does he exist always and everywhere. Whence it is that he is entirely like himself, all eye, all ear, all brain, all arm, all

sensation, all intelligence, all action; but this in a way not at all like men, in a way not at all like bodies, in a way utterly unknown to us. As a blind man has no idea of colors, so have not we any idea of the *modus* whereby God, most wise, perceives and understands all things. He is entirely void of all body and bodily figure; and, therefore, cannot be either seen, or heard, or felt; nor ought he to be worshiped under any bodily shape. We have the idea of his attributes, but do not at all know what the substance of anything is. We see only the figures and colors of bodies, we hear only their sounds, we feel only their outward surfaces, we smell only their scents, and we taste only their savors; but we don't know their inmost substances by any sensation or internal reflection; and much less have we any idea of the substance of God. We know him only by his properties, and attributes, and the most wise and excellent structures of his creatures, and by final causes; while we adore and worship him on account of his dominion. For a God without dominion, providence, and first causes, is nothing else but fate and nature."

We have thus looked briefly at the doctrine of causes, and considered some of the evidences that there is a great first cause. We have seen that there is, and that there must, in the very nature of things, be an intelligent, all-powerful, necessary being, who gave existence to the great universe over which he rules and reigns. But this is not all; the question very naturally presents itself, Has he given existence to beings who are, like himself, possessed of intelligence, sensibility, and will? Are there other first causes in existence? Have we any evidence that such is actually the case? In a future number of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM these important questions will be considered (*Deo volente*), and answered according to ability.

ART. V.—*Our Place in the Temple of Letters.*

Books are the food of youth; the delight of old age; the ornament of prosperity; the refuge and comfort of adversity; a delight at home and no hindrance abroad; companions by night, in traveling, in the country.—*Cicero*.

FROM time immemorial there has prevailed in the wide family of man, through all its branches and races, and all along the ages, as also among all existing representatives of the races, the conviction that what we are and do, belongs, somehow, more to the future than to the present. A desire to perpetuate in some other form the life that now is, at least in its results, and a vague, though settled belief, that in some way we are to be perpetuated, are well-nigh co-existent with the human race. Hidden away in this desire is found the germ of all records, of whatever form, that the ingenuity of man could suggest, from the crudest ages of art onward to the magnificent epoch of to-day, an epoch in which the printing press unquestionably holds the first place in the long list of honored and mighty agencies which inspire or sway the great mind of the world. The development of letters from those crude originals in the morning twilight of history up to the high noon of this century is nothing else than marvelous.

What contrasts exist between the magnificent and ever-enduring monuments of our own time, the splendid volumes with which the press is filling the world, and the rude cairns, the altars, leaf and leather books, or the knotted cords and groves which hold for us the root-germs of all our earlier history. One of the most enviable and imperishable monuments of all the great civilizations of the world is built upon the book shelves of our private and public libraries, those vast treasure-cities where are kept the golden grains that have been gathered or gleaned by the literary reapers from the thinking hosts of all the generations of men. War, waste, and wrong have swept their remorseless revolutions across the arena of the nations. Their gardens have become

desolate, and their cities covered with the drifting sands of the desert, but out of the crumbling ruins have been gathered some beautiful blocks of literary gold.

The graceful outlines of a vein have been discovered which, though dimly traced, will soon open out into rich and ample deposits of precious metal. Remnants of once powerful and cultivated nations, countless ruins of once gorgeous cities and splendid kingdoms meet us on every hand, and fix the mind with a wand of more than magical power. But how void of interest were all of these in a practical and utilitarian age like ours, were it not for their place in this great monument which the letters of the ages have built silently and strongly as the polyp builds continents in the sea.

The Jew of to-day is a veritable Ishmaelite. Whether he will or not, his hand is, in some measure, against every other man, and every other man's hand against him. He is not an attractive man. He does not, by what he is or seems to us, gather about him antagonistic elements, or soften into harmony discordant notes. But turning away from the living representative, sadly attenuated in all the stronger and better characteristics of his illustrious ancestors, and consulting his philosopher's stone, in our great temple, we are caught up at once into a mount of transfiguration. A light supernal infolding itself in brightness rolls about us. We are charmed into silent awe and inexpressible admiration as we behold the illustrious law-giver of their nation, and as we trace his wonderful life through the dim aisles of literature. What a glorious company group about him as a great central figure, as he and Elias were grouped with Jesus in that other Transfiguration Mount! We are overwhelmed by the sublime heroism and transcendent faith of Abraham. But when the pen of the ready writer preserves to us almost the entrancing touch of David's harp, and the grand, ravishing sweep of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Habakkuk, as the prophetic chariot bears them onward through the darkness that hangs about the distant future, and sparks of light come flashing back from the "last times," and we catch foregleams of the "latter-days," in these volumes, hoary with age, born in the leaf and the papyrus era of literature, it adds a

new interest to the stern, dark-faced man who greets us so courteously in all the lines of trade and commerce. It is his literature, and that the seal of Providence is upon his people, as that literature reveals, that make the Jew of to-day one of the most interesting actors in the great problem of humanity. It is to her place in the temple of letters that England is chiefly indebted for the proud position she occupies to-day among the nations of the world. Nor are the semi-civilized "children of the sun," and their Asiatic neighbors, unconscious of the position to which their place in letters entitles them and the power which their literature confers upon them.

Little thought their remote ancestors, in the dreamy days of the "long ago," standing in the depth of some Asiatic forest, hoary with the trailing of lonely ages, "shadowy with the green fans and sword-blades of the palm tribe, and the giant fronds of the purple streaked banana, etching with a thorn on some thick-fleshed leaf, torn from the luxuriant shrub-wood around him, rude images of the beasts he hunted or the arrows he shot," (Collier's His. Eng. Literature, page 9,) that he was the pioneer book-maker of the world. His simple, unprophetic nature dreamed not that what he did was as the planting of precious seeds that develop into trees of life, bearing golden fruit "for the healing of the nations," or bitter fruits to blight and curse the world in the ages to come. Not so Laurenzes John Coster, of Haerlem, cutting letters and images on the soft bark of the forest trees, from which was printed the first book, (*Speculum Humanæ Salvationis*), a book of images in A. D. 1438, nor Faust, nor Gutenberg, nor Peter Schaeffer.

They dreamed grand solid dreams, or rather profound prophecies of the mighty world which was locked up in their little noiseless types. But their wildest dreams never reached beyond the first border line of the vast realm which awaited the conquests of their all-conquering art. The infant prodigy, born of their inventive genius, grew rapidly and surely toward manhood, shaking down the blessed fruits from the tree of letters, through all subsequent centuries, until to-day he stands out before us, apparently a giant of full

strength, wielding a power for good or ill, that is mightier than the sword, wider than the seas, and more lasting in its results than the earth itself.

In the books of to-day, the dead of all past times yet speak to us. What they were and did and said who lived hundreds of centuries before we were born, is now contributing toward the sum of what we are and do and say, more than we may be at first aware of. In every field of thought, in every line of art, there is the suggestion of a regular descent, an unbroken succession from the thinkers of the first ages of thought, that are known to history, on down to those of our own times. The freshest and brightest thoughts of to-day, in whatever form they may be cast, or in whatever vesture clad, are, in an obvious sense, the progeny of the treasured wealth of letters that other centuries than ours have gathered into the storehouse of literature. "The debt which we owe to former ages," says Lord Macaulay, (Review of Basil Montagu's Bacon,) "is incalculable. They have guided us to truth. They have filled the mind with noble and graceful images. They stand by us in all vicissitudes, comforters in sorrow, nurses in sickness, companions in solitude. Their friendships are exposed to no dangers from occurrences by which other attachments are weakened or dissolved; time glides on; fortune is inconsistent; tempers are soured; bonds which seemed indissoluble are daily sundered by interest, by emulation, or by caprice; but no such cause can affect the converse we hold with the highest of human intellects. That placid intercourse is disturbed by no jealousies or resentments.

There are the old friends who are never seen with new faces, who are the same in wealth and in poverty, in glory and in obscurity. With the dead there is no rivalry. In the dead there is no change. Plato is never sullen. Cervantes is never petulant. Demosthenese never comes unseasonably. Dante never stays too long. No difference of political opinion can alienate Cicero. No heresy can excite the horror of Bossuet."

Will any one deny that the offerings of these writers to the temple of letters secured to them almost infinitely more

power to influence for weal or woe the destinies of the human race than their lives had done? The latter can hardly be compared to their infancy, in its relation to the prolonged and robust manhood of their beings.

How true the eloquent lines of Southey, whose highest conception of earthly happiness was to dwell without molestation among his books :

My hopes are with the dead, anon
My place with them will be,
And I with them shall travel on
Through all futurity;
Yet, leaving here a name, I trust,
That will not perish in the dust.

How grandly the sphere of a single, frail human life broadens; and rises from the point of view of this wonderful temple of letters until the imagination can follow no further!

If only we could take in the full scope and potency, the immortal mission of letters in their bearing upon the best types of civilization and culture, we could predict with probable certainty the future of a community from its present place in literature; for, when a few hundred years have passed, a nation's literature will reproduce its character for good or evil purposes and effects. With profound convictions of the potency of letters, as instruments in the providence of God, for blessing and bringing the world to Christ, with what prayer and vigilance, with what zeal and self-denial should Christians labor to create and disseminate a wholesome, sanctified, permanent literature.

So prominent were the early services rendered the cause of truth, by the art of printing, and so remarkable the circumstances attending the introduction of this mighty agency, that wise and devout men have not hesitated to declare it a special providence of God, designed to facilitate the dissemination and defense of his own truth.

And, indeed, the service which the press has done to the cause of truth, when directed by wise and conscientious Christian people is immense. It is inestimable. It is one of the tokens of a superintending providence in the development

and growth of Christianity, that so mighty an agency has been so extensively utilized by it.

But do Christians realize the extent to which the tireless enemies of truth are using this same potent agency, fighting the truth with its own weapons, as Satan sought to win the Savior to his cause by seizing upon portions of Scripture and applying them to suit his dreadful purpose?

I think we are in danger of forgetting, or underrating the extent and power of a corrupt literature, under the direction of corrupt minds. The mass of our people apparently believe that Christians, chiefly, are using this agency, for the defense and propagation of the truth. Would that this were true. But every intelligent reader, or observer knows full well that this is not the case. Error has its presses running night and day in all the lands throughout Christendom. Hundreds of vile journals, of the most pernicious tendency, are circulating in all countries on both sides of the sea. Homes where truth is revered, are invaded by them. Christian households patronize these periodicals. The tastes of the young are being moulded by them. Christian men engage in the business of distributing, if not in publishing these periodicals, without reflecting, apparently, upon the evils which they thus encourage. A Christian newsman who had for sometime dealt in tobacco, declared that he could no longer deal out the vile narcotic. He accordingly closed out his stock and gave up that part of his business, but every day people were buying from his shelves illustrated periodicals, and miserable, crime-producing novels, and it had not, apparently, occurred to him that this almost fiendish literature, was infinitely more hurtful to humanity than the tobacco which his conscience would not suffer him to sell. The number of positively immoral books published annually, is estimated at thirty millions. This does not include the pernicious Sunday-School literature, of which there is an immense surplus, nor the infidelity which fills the book shelves in the form and garb of works of science. Perhaps there are ten millions of these issued annually. England alone circulates four hundred thousand immoral publications weekly, or

twenty millions annually. Of these, about twelve million five hundred thousand are infidel, and more than half a million atheistic. The half million of popish publications should, perhaps, be added to the dreadful catalogue.

Then to this immense production and circulation of works in permanent form, we must add nearly thirty millions of papers and periodicals classed as "openly vicious and immoral."

Now against this the annual issues of Bibles, Testaments, and religious periodicals of every kind, amounts in the aggregate only to about twenty-four and a half millions, leaving a balance on the side of evil of nearly four and a half millions. (Book and its Story.)

In the absence of positive information on this subject, we cannot approximate the relative zeal of the adherents of truth and error in their use of this great agency in our own country. But from the widely diffused facilities for printing and the well-known disposition of the average American to "rush into print," it is at least safe to say that the relative attitude of truth and error in this respect is no more favorable to the former among us than in England; while in other book-making countries the balance is much larger on the wrong side than even in these countries. Our boasted wisdom and benevolence in providing and using means for the planting of the kingdom of God goes for naught, for in this line we have allowed our enemies to turn our own guns upon us. The enemies of the truth have several millions more soldiers in the field, fighting against us than we can oppose to them, for every book is a soldier, fighting either for the wrong or the right. They have already taken many of our strongholds which they hold in spite of us, by the potent charm of their literature. They occupy positions which we are not prepared to reach. It is not that the great body of the foes of truth are thinkers, or writers; as a class they are not. Nor are they any the less in bondage to the opinions of others, than the friends of the Bible. But those who manufacture public opinion for them on this subject are generally thinkers and writers. Their thoughts are printed and scattered among the masses. Printed and illustrated infidelity

is to be found in all parts of the land. The "Devil's Colporteurs," as the peddlers of these pernicious publications have been aptly called, travel upon the same trains and boats, and thoroughfares with the missionaries, Bible agents and colporteurs and the former often make the most impression upon the masses.

Nor is the dreadful poison of this vile literature confined to publications professedly in the interest of infidelity. The whole literary atmosphere seems at times to be full of this moral miasma. The profoundest works of philosophy and the most charming works of fiction are practically, though insidiously, waging a determined warfare against revealed truth. The so-called independent secular journalism of the day is very often, if not generally, either in sympathy with, or indifferent to, the assaults of unbelief upon the truth.

These questions then, are raised, for they seem to be in order, Must this mighty agency of the devil continue? and if not, How are we to arrest the influence of these mighty agencies? It seems to me that there can be but one answer, and that is at hand. These agencies are foes of truth. We must grapple with them. Greek must meet Greek. Books must encounter books. Sanctified art must grapple with corrupt and demoralizing art. Wherever an enemy's book has gone, the book of truth must follow it. Where they have not penetrated, let the colporteur go. Many, perhaps, who have read the books of the former, will read those of the latter. Those who have taken the poison may be induced to take the antidote, and those who have not taken the poison may be protected from it. The world is hungry for books, and must be fed. If wholesome and nourishing food is not provided, that which is poisonous or unwholesome will be devoured by the great insatiate soul of humanity. Are not the highways of literature free to the heralds of God's truth? aye, and its by-ways, too? The fountains of truth are unexhausted and inexhaustible. Its mighty weapons have not all been used. There is a demand now upon Christian literature for clear, solid, convincing, conclusive writing upon the great themes of truth to which the vigorous assaults of error have more than ever called the attention of the whole thinking

world. The writers of such books are at hand. Furnish them with the facilities for publishing and distributing their books. Let them once feel that such work is demanded by the cause of truth, and they will not be slow to respond.

But what, I would ask by way of pointing the foregoing facts and considerations, is the place of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church in letters? What part of the power and glory of literature have we? Alas, a very small morsel; a faint and feeble ray. And that too, after sixty years of organic life and growth. The full catalogue of the publications of our Church lies before me, as issued by our Board of Publication, in 1861. It contains just seventeen Cumberland Presbyterian publications, although some of these are on the shelves of the Board, on sale for their respective authors, and do not belong to the Board or the Church, but to individuals. Six of the seventeen works, including two catechisms, are very small, the merest tracts in size. Deducting two others, the Hymn Book and Confession of Faith, just nine distinct works remain, that may be classed as of the permanent literature of our denomination. These nine works were "Donnell's Thoughts," "Ewing's Lectures," "Infant Philosophy," which belonged to the Board, and "Life and Times of Ewing," "Life of Rev. Geo. Donnell," "Practical Sermons" by Dr. Wilson, "Doctrines of Grace," Crisman's "Origin and Doctrines," Beard's "Lectures," (first vol.) which were then the property of their authors. The reading matter in these nine volumes aggregated considerably less than three thousand pages. This was the contribution to the world's literature in half a century, of what we were pleased long ago to style a great church. Is it a matter to boast of as some have publicly boasted? It appeared to the writer then, and so appears now, as a cause for shame rather. For then, as now, we were estimating our communicants at from ninety thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand, while our ministerial roll, and our list of educational enterprises were about as long as they are now. There can be no doubt that facts like these furnished weapons of great effectiveness to those who opposed this new movement in the ecclesiastical world. It certainly deepened the shadow of truth in the stale though pop-

ular charge of Calvinists, that our denomination was opposed to education, especially to an educated ministry.

Nor was the character of all the works in the foregoing list creditable to the literary character of a great religious denomination. With a few notable exceptions, as, for instance, Dr. Cossitt's "Life and Times of Ewing," Dr. Anderson's "Life of Geo. Donnell," Lindley's "Infant Philosophy," and Beard's "Theology," which gave evidence of very careful literary finish and profound thought, the works on our book shelves were not a recommendation of the denomination on the score of literary taste and culture. Mr. Ewing's admirable lectures were little more than sketches of the wonderful doctrinal sermons which he preached, and they first assumed the form in which they now appear while their author was instructing a class of young men who were preparing for the ministry.

For thorough logical acumen, and clear searching analysis, these lectures are indeed of a very high order. Could these great features have been moulded by the polish and graceful culture of Cossitt, Mr. Ewing's book would have deserved a place in any library. With whatever faults of style the critic may invest it, this book has, nevertheless, a permanent place in the literature of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. A similar estimate perhaps should be given of Mr. Donnell's "Thoughts," a book filled with reflections upon the great religious themes of that age in which the Cumberland Presbyterian Church endured its sorest conflicts. A little needed elaboration in some instances, a little less redundancy in others, and a careful literary working up by its distinguished author would have made "Donnell's Thoughts" a popular book anywhere. Of other works in this list, that of Dr. Cossitt is beyond all praise. His style is most exalted; and pleasing, while his analysis of character, his statement of principles and events, united with his high culture, enabled him to give the Church, and the world, perhaps, the most valuable book ever yet issued by the ecclesiastical body whose interests it represents, and whose cause it defends. It is, and will probably continue to be for some time to come, the best history and defense of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church.

It combines gracefully and in due proportion, biography, history and apology, and from every point of view, deserves a much wider circulation and reading than it has yet received. Indeed, it is a poor compliment to the literary taste of the membership of our denomination that they have allowed a work of such sterling worth to lie so long upon the shelves of our book store. Should the improved taste of the Church demand new and repeated editions of this incomparable work, it would be but the plainest and simplest recognition of true merit, and but common justice to one of the most polished and laborious thinkers which the first half century of our Church produced. But by all odds the greatest literary work yet accomplished by our Church, is that of the Rev. Richard Beard, D.D., of Cumberland University. The works of this laborious author have chiefly been published within the last fifteen years. They are "Lectures on Theology," 3 vols. 8vo; "Biographical Sketches," 2 vols. 12mo; "Why am I a Cumberland Presbyterian?" 12mo; "Miscellaneous Sermons and Reviews," 12mo.

To Dr. Beard's "Lectures," it is perhaps no great compliment to compare them with the universally admired works of the great Dr. Hodge, of Princeton Theological Seminary. But having made this comparison carefully upon a great many points of common ground, I am prepared to say that for clear, unequivocal statements and definitions, cogent logic, searching but intelligible analysis, for apposite, illustrative proofs and practical exemplifications, and above all, for fullness of the spirit of the Bible, the great Princeton theologian is not the superior of the quiet, unassuming, Lebanon professor. Of wide-ranged and profound scholarship, as also of originality, Princeton makes a better showing through its great leader, Dr. Hodge, but against this, I place the meekness, marked piety, unsurpassed industry, fairness, candor, and broad catholicity of Lebanon, as developed in the works of Dr. Beard.

In "Why am I a Cumberland Presbyterian?" though a prize essay, there is certainly not so much of Dr. Beard as in the volumes already mentioned. But as a manual of comparative theology, it is an admirable production. Indeed,

there is nothing in the catalogues equal to it, for fairness, candor and catholicity. One feels no hesitancy in placing it in the hands of the veriest partizan of another denomination. No one can be offended at its masterly statements of distinctive Cumberland Presbyterian theology. And all readers of it must be charmed by the sweetness and beauty of its temper.

There is one serious objection to the otherwise excellent "Biographical Sketches," that is their brevity. They are so good that no one is willing to leave them so soon.

"Sermons and Reviews" is a complete vindication of the literary power of its author. Especially does this power appear in the five masterly reviews and the seven essays therein contained. The range of the book is as broad as the life of its author, and the thought-range in which he lived.

Several other works have recently been added to our catalogue, such as Dr. Dillard's "Medium Theology," Ewing's "Historical Memoirs," and the nucleus of a Sunday-school literature. Each of these books fills an important place and demand in our literature, though none of them will add greatly to our honor in the world's great monument of letters. And when all has been said that can be said to our credit in this department, it must still be confessed that our place in that mighty temple is exceedingly small, far too small for our opportunities.

And yet there are obvious reasons and causes patent for this meagreness of our literature. The early labors of our preachers, teachers, and thinkers, were in the front of a mighty westward emigration. They were pioneer preachers to pioneer hearers. The laborers were few, the fields large, and the demands upon their time and energies extraordinarily large and numerous. They were compelled to think, for the most part, upon their feet or in their saddles. They had neither time nor opportunity to write, for multitudes waited in the forests for the words of life from their lips, who else had gone hungry away. When not actually engaged in the work of their ministry, many of them had, like Paul at Corinth, to labor with their own hands, ministering to their necessities and those dependent upon them; for they had no church extension funds or missionary boards behind them.

The beginnings of the Church were with the beginnings of social life in the great West, and the churches thus established were among a people who had immense prospects before them, but who, as yet, had not had time to develop the boundless resources of the great country to which the Lord had called them. The churches were generally poor, so that there were no funds for publishing books, had the manuscripts been furnished. These and similar circumstances palliate the wrong. But even our most charitable view of these causes will not fully justify our poverty of literature, during the first fifty years of our existence. There were resources at command of the Church even then for a far better showing than one volume in three years, for fifty years. Since the grounds upon which the new denomination, in the providence of God, came into being were largely doctrinal, and those who would be likely to make the most opposition against them, would seldom hear the living expounders of the "Medium Theology," it was unquestionably a great mistake not to send upon the world a few solid and invincible publications at the very beginning of this great movement. The fruits of that mistake are being gathered now. They are not pleasant fruits.

Whatever may be urged in justification of this mistake at that time, cannot be urged at the present time; for the same demand exists now as then, a most urgent demand, for a solid, judicious, and scholarly work, of fair proportions and finished, attractive style, which will serve to attract the many great minds, awakened by the recent discussion of the question of organic union, to the theology and history of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. Beard's Theology is too elaborate for this purpose. The little works of Crisman, Templeton, Beard, and Love, are liable to the opposite objection; besides, being designed principally for the masses, they are not adapted to meet the wants of theologians, upon whom we must depend chiefly for the introduction of our theological tenets to the notice of the masses of Christian thinkers and workers in other communions. The object of such a work should not be to win denominational proselytes. This would be a violation of the whole tenor of our

work, as our history will show. But God, in his all-wise ways, affords us the opportunity now of being heard in our own defense against the volleys that are poured upon us from Arminian and Calvinistic batteries. There is a fine opportunity now for Cumberland Presbyterians to be heard in the great arena of theological combat. Thus far we have no elaborate and scholarly work devoted exclusively to the statement and defense of the medium theology, in such a style as to commend it to thinking people. Such a work would, at this particular period of our history, do us incalculable service.

The action of a late General Assembly of our Church in declining the overtures of the Presbyterian General Assembly for organic union, necessarily precipitates us into the theological war afresh—war offensive and defensive. If we are successful, we must have some additional and better instrumentalities. To my mind, the medium theology has not yet been fully stated, nor conclusively vindicated. The Scriptures settle that point for me most conclusively. But if I did not already hold such a theology, especially if I held to Arminianism or Calvinism, nothing that has been written from the Cumberland Presbyterian point of view, would settle the question with me in favor of the medium theology. Many of those who have written upon this subject, have written with strong bias. They believe the medium theology heartily, and it is difficult for them to see how others can reject it. With the exception of the venerable Dr. Beard, who has written but little upon this distinctive phase of our theology, and Mr. Love, in his excellent little tract, all the works on this subject yet published, betray a very strong bias, no little boasting and prejudice, which must tend to drive away from them the calm and intelligent thinker. They serve an excellent practical purpose among the masses for whom they were designed. But they do not seem to me to meet the demand of the present hour in its broadest needs. In some of these tracts, there are unfortunate applications, misreadings, and superficial interpretations of the Holy Word.

Our cause is broad, and true, and good enough, to allow the most honest candor, and the profoundest and most exhaustive

exegesis of such passages of the Bible as are urged in support of, or in opposition to, the great principles of the medium theology. I repeat then that the demand is upon us for this work. We need it greatly now. Let us have it. Let the world have it.

Then we need for general use among our own people, and for circulation elsewhere, an elaborate, exhaustive, and carefully finished history of our denomination. Such a history could and should be written from the ample notes which are now being furnished by that prodigious literary worker, Dr. J. B. Lindsley, in successive numbers of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM; and we have among us the writers. Next to these we are greatly in need of a digest of the laws enacted by our General Assemblies. Our church legislation is burdened, hindered, and confused, by this lack, which ought not to continue. All of these wants are practical. They are present, urgent wants, in my conception; and I am persuaded that this feeling is quite general.

But beyond these tangible, palpable literary necessities of our Church, there is before us a broad field for authorship, and practical beneficence, upon the cultivation of which we are only just entering. Upon this great and wide field a rich and bounteous harvest awaits our toil. Shall we falter and pause upon the border, with the golden grain waving in majesty and beauty just beyond us, but within the easy reach of our sickles? Shall our noble beginning in Sabbath-school literature remain a beginning? There is and can be no other interest of the Church which is worthy to supersede it. It has seemed to me a calamity to the noble work of our Board of Publication, and the great literary work and growth of our Church, that just as our permanent literature had received a new, and, as we fondly hoped, a lasting impetus of growth, the chief energies of the whole Church should have been suddenly transferred from that work to the newspaper field, and especially so, when that field was, in my judgment, then in a better state of cultivation, and far more productive, than it is now, or ever can be, under the dominion of an official press.

But we must not, and will not, waste our precious time brooding over these reverses. Our work of publication must

go on. Our book-making must not languish. The interest of the whole Church must be wrought up to that pitch of literary enthusiasm, which will move the cash currents, with a wider, deeper, and stronger flow into the treasury of our Board. The pens and pulpits of the whole Church must speak out incessantly, strongly, and stirringly, upon the momentous question. Let there be a resolute purpose among our people, preachers, and laymen, to lift our literary standard higher and higher. We have wrought but feebly in the past upon the magnificent temple of letters, whose great and enduring walls, are rising steadily around us. Small, indeed, is our percentage of the forty millions of dollars which the builders are annually putting into this sublime temple, and proportionally small must be our future inheritance in it. But we must, we will, retrieve, the shortcomings of the past. The strong and steady sinews of mature strength are upon us now. The plea of infancy and youth is effete. In our manly strength, we must have in the near and long future, a larger and an enduring place in the world's great temple of letters.

ART. VI.—*"The Coming Man."*

THE developments of history, sacred and profane, all conspire to the one great truth, that there must be one ruler for the whole universe, but particularly for mankind. The universal historian cannot but smile in his sleeve, as he looks upon the fretful and feverish efforts that human aspirations have made toward universal dominion. In the infancy of human history, an epoch now grown old with revolving years, the "mighty hunter" appeared, and, notwithstanding God had twice commanded that man should spread over the whole earth, erected a lofty tower to be the pride and glory of the people. In the matchless account of this great transaction,

are not the elements of universal empire seen as the object of ambition?

With primeval notions of the formation of the earth and the heavens, what could a tower reaching to the heavens mean except a sign of universal authority? What does the expression, "lest we be scattered abroad upon the face of the whole earth" mean but that some one might slip the "noose" of Nimrod's authority, and sully the "name" of Nimrod's fame in the earth?

Alexander the Great is a well known example of the ambition of authority. Not satisfied with enlarging his dominion of universal power among men, he was ambitious of divine prerogatives.

When Hanibal swore eternal hatred to the Romans, who were the ruling people of the earth, and carried out the spirit of that oath by thrusting war right into the very heart of their government, it is but reasonable to suppose that he at least dreamed of general authority.

It has been often said that Europe trembled at the name of Napoleon, who carried war beyond the boundaries of Europe to the land of Mizraim, the home of the Pharaohs and Ptolemies, and even up toward the "entering in of Hamath." Why would he disturb his countrymen and the people of foreign lands, and march over the frozen snows of Russia, if he had no aspirations for unlimited dominion? The foregoing names only are mentioned. No doubt the desire has been entertained by thousands not so well known. These facts show that the idea of universal power is appreciated by man.

Upon the other hand, without a sense of subordination, no human authority could be maintained for any length of time. Had not the Medes submitted to Dejoces, he could never have built his palace of seclusion, nor the city of authority, nor sat on the throne for fifty-three years.

The fact that men went about to make brick, mortar, the city, and the tower, argues that a sense of subordination was felt in Nimrod's time. When the children of Israel asked for a king that they might be like other nations, it presents us not only with the truth that they wished to be in the

fashion, but that they had the notion of subordination. Why did so many thousands of Assyrians, Babylonians, and Chaldeans submit to the authority of a few persons, if the idea of subordination is not largely felt in the human soul? Why did the whole nation of the Egyptians allow themselves to become a nation of slaves, if this notion is a stranger to the human mind? Why did they not rather break open Pharaoh's barns, and even tear down every vestage of his authority? Thus the history of all kingdoms, empires, and governments is a blazing argument for this great principle of human nature.

Having seen from a brief survey of history, which could be greatly enlarged were it necessary, the two great subjective conditions of universal reign, our next inquiry will be to find a man qualified for the relationship of universal governor, for he must at least be a man. And now a grand search begins. We cast our eyes over the past: we hunt out the Nimrods, the Nebuchadnezzars, the Cyrus, the Alexanders, the Cæsars, the Hannibals, and the Napoleons, and not one is equal to the responsibilities of the position.

When one goes out upon the ocean of simple human history to find a man for universal governor, he is much like the dove that went out of Noah's ark—he finds no rest for the sole of his foot. The grand necessity is a shoreless ocean to mere human nature, so far as the profane history of the past is concerned. We can take just as large a section of the past as we wish and extend it out into the future, with all its facts and figures, and there will be certainly no hope for the "coming man," whoever he may be.

The foregone history of the world shows remarkable defects in the qualifications of mere human nature for general empire:

1st. A universal ruler of men must himself be subordinate. There is a higher power than that of man. Whoever ignores this fact is utterly disqualified for the exercise of general control. Nimrod did not entertain a regard for the power of God, for his decretals were in direct opposition to the commands of God. Alexander the Great, it seems, in order to throw off whatever of restraint he might have had in view

of the gods, aspired to be one himself. His insubordination to a higher power was so great, that he desired, by one step, to place himself above all subordination. Nearly all of those who have exercised great power in the world, have, in some instances, shown that they defied God and man. Hence, the first great qualification has in human rulers always been, more or less, wanting.

2nd. Justice should be the habitation of his throne. The world has never grown tired of parading Solomon's wisdom, involving in the general notion of wisdom his justice. Still he was chargeable with injustice toward man and toward God.

While it is not the purpose of this paper to traduce the great of earth, truth demands of us to say that justice has not always been rendered by those in authority. To be brief, man is finite, and his whole history shows him to be corrupt: so that he is disqualified in every way for universal control, and, in fact, his history amply demonstrates the truth of the position.

We have spoken of those who have exercised civil authority over men. Were we to turn to those who have exercised intellectual and moral influence, imperfection would still glare in our faces. Having seen that men have ambition for universal empire, that mankind have shown wonderful submission to those who have aspired to such control, and further, that enormous failures to secure and to hold general control have marked the history of nations, the question may be asked, Can not some one be found who is qualified well for, and in every way worthy of, so exalted a station? Boldly, we say, Yes! Such a personage has already been presented to the world by its own history. The rejected Stone, Jesus of Nazareth, whose name is a magic spell, long since ascended from the lofty side of Olivet, yet he holds sway over more hearts to-day, on the earth, than ever a Cæsar ruled.

We reverently, adoringly, present Jesus, the babe of Bethlehem, and the man of Nazareth, as a perfect ruler of men. It is time for the world to begin practically to regard him in the true light, the destined potentate of mankind. While the writer of this paper has a high regard for simple human worth, a due respect for good kings and presidents, and is al-

ways disposed to submit to the powers that be, he has far more regard for the authority of Jesus Christ than for all the kings and potentates of the earth combined. Absolutely, Jesus Christ is the "chief among ten thousand." He is every way worthy and well qualified for the office of universal King.

In the first place he is subordinate to the unseen Ruler of the universe. The very highest and most perfect expression of submission was made by him in the garden of Gethsemane, when, in agony, he said, "Thy will be done." His justice is unimpeachable, for Pilate said, "I have found no fault in this man." He has all the qualifications of greatness, and, it is said, "in him is no sin." According to his own teachings, his principle and law of government are to love God supremely, and to love our neighbor as ourselves. This is the whole law in a small compass.

Thus he taught: When he was reviled, he reviled not again; when he was buffeted, he resisted not evil; when he was wounded even unto death, he said, "Father, forgive." Thus he did: He made the power of teaching doubly powerful by the actual, personal enforcement of his transcendent precepts.

Such are the qualifications of his simple manhood. The manhood of Christ is qualified for the high office of potentate of all peoples of all ages, by being united with Deity. This is an awful standpoint, higher than any other mortal has ever stood. Jacob saw a ladder reaching up to Deity, but he stepped not upon the first round of it himself. Yet Jesus of Nazareth was taken up above the topmost round, and his human personality absorbed into the Divine Personality, till he could say, "I and my Father are one." Mystical relationship! How truly is he the "Wonderful," the "Counselor," "the mighty God," and shall not every knee bow to him, and every tongue confess that Jesus Christ is Lord?

The Book of books declares him to be the "coming man." The Jews held the law to be of God; therefore whoever recognized the law, recognized God. Whoever despised the law was an atheist to them. So when they saw Jesus and his disciples going through the corn on the Sabbath, and

plucking the ears, they remonstrated with Jesus' disciples, but they were told that he was Lord of the Sabbath. A part of the precious message borne by the glorious messenger from heaven to the virgin at Nazareth, was this, "And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever, and of his kingdom there shall be no end."

Paul came not "with excellency of speech," or trusting in the wisdom of this world's princes, but in the hidden and eternal mysteries of God, "which none of the princes of this world knew: for had they known it they would not have crucified the Lord of glory." Again he says, "For he must reign till he hath put all enemies under his feet." All enemies to God and man's happiness must be subdued, and the Nazarene must do it. St. Paul to the Philippians, speaks in the following indubitable language: "And being found in the fashion as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross; wherefore God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father."

John saw in the holy vision that which was

Not spoke in word, nor blazed in scroll,

But borne and branded on the soul,

the focal point of God's enemies, and consequently of man's, to be at and of Rome. He saw her hosts pouring out of her gates and flooding the nations, as Vesuvius sometimes sends out her scalding lava upon adjacent valleys, and he said, "These shall make war with the Lamb, and the Lamb shall overcome them: for he is Lord of lords, and King of kings." He is the Lord, the King not only of the American, the European, the Asiatic, and the African, as they now live, but of the Americans, the Europeans, the Asiatics and the Africans who have lived immediately in the past, and back, back, back, in the profound depths of the past, embracing the Adamic key of human existence upon the earth; for, says the apostle to the Gentiles, "For to this end Christ both

died, and rose, and revived, that he might be Lord both of the dead and living."

To the Ephesians it is declared that God "set him at his own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." There is a lordship or a kingship declared to him, unknown of any other human being.

To the Colossians it is asserted of him that he "is the image of the invisible God, the first born of every creature; for by him were all things created, that are in heaven and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers; all things were created by him and for him;" by which we are plainly taught that he is not only to rule the nations of men, but that he is to rule over the higher orders of beings, until he shall stand higher than the tallest archangel himself.

Finally, on this point, there is to be a time when his vesture shall not be gambled for by casting lots, as it once was. Being spiritualized and glorified as he now is, his vesture is such as spirits wear, or as spiritual bodies have on. It is revealed that "he hath on his vesture and on his thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS."

Such are the developments of the New Testament on this subject. They are supported by the Scriptures of the Old Testament, some of which may appropriately be given. In regard to Christ's humanity they are, of course, prophetic. "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a law-giver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be." "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous Branch, and a King shall reign, and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice in the earth." "And thou, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the least among the princes of Judah; for out of thee shall come a Governor that shall rule my people Israel." "Behold a King shall reign in righteousness, and princes shall rule in judgment." "I saw in the night visions, and behold one like the Son of man

came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before him; and there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed." "And when he had spoken these things, while they beheld, he was taken up; and a cloud received him out of their sight. And while they looked steadfastly toward heaven as he went up, behold, two men stood by them in white apparel; which also said, Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This same Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven."

These scriptures (the last quoted being from the New Testament) show that while he is a King, a Ruler, a Governor, and has been on the earth in human nature, and returned to heaven again, yet he is to come in the clouds to carry forward and perfect what the world has never yet realized. Oh, his wonderful kingdom! Even so, come, Lord Jesus, thou "coming man."

We would still draw out the truth that Jesus of Nazareth is destined to practically and actually rule over all human spirits. The objector may ask, Why did he not accept the kingdom or government of the Jews when they would have made him king even by force? Why did he let so splendid an opportunity pass? Why did he not clothe himself with purple and fine linen, as eastern potentates usually did? These and many other questions have, doubtless, been asked thousands of times, and now the poor old kingdoms of Judah and of Israel, have long lain in the graveyard of nations. Splendid mausoleums have, for centuries, towered over them. They seem almost as "a tale that is told," and have

Gone glimmering through the dream of things that were,
A schoolboy's tale, the wonder of an hour.

Neighboring nations too have sunken down to rest. The echo of their greatness is still reverberating in our halls of learning. In vain we parade their greatness. *Ilium fuit* is said of them and must be forever said. But what of Jesus

who declined the honors of royalty? Of him it can be said, "*Priam fuit, Cæsar fuit, Hannibal fuit*, but blessed be the name of God, *Jesus is*." He placed his feet upon the hillocks of governments that were, and might have been, tendered him, and shouldered that weight of authority, which has grown more powerful the longer he has borne it. He exercises authority to-day on the earth, as the unseen Governor, to an extent he has never exercised it before. What does it matter, if he is not seen in bodily form, or is not surrounded by the pageantry of this world, such as kings usually have, or may not have a cabinet about him, as presidents have? He declined these once, and has gained great power as a ruler of hearts. Does he need these now any more than he did then? Indeed, he is superior to all these, as the mighty facts of history of to-day demonstrates. They are the trappings of men who are simply human. The retinue of Jesus is the pageantry of kings, together with the crowned heads themselves. Oh, Christians, why not accept the facts that are now patent to all?

If the writer of this paper has read the history of the world to any purpose, one of its lessons has been the gradual distrust in human governments, and an equally gradual confidence in and upbuilding of the Redeemer's kingdom. This is a grand argument for the universal dominion of Jesus. It cannot be elaborated in this place, but simply touched upon. The confidence that men used to exercise in human authority may be seen by a thousand indices in the book of man's deeds. The walls of Babylon and its towers; its hanging gardens; its grand proportions generally; the pyramids of Egypt; the cities, catacombs, and walls in the land of Mizraim; the underground palaces of Nineveh; the huge objects of devotion that lie entombed in the sand; and generally the stupendous architecture of the East, are to-day a profound argument for the confidence man once placed in man, and for the unquestioned authority which man exercised over his fellows. Reader, think about it. Those very ruins speak of better times to come.

The fact that Pharaoh did actually buy the persons of his subjects, only silently shows the spirit of the age in which he domineered over men. Those thousands of workmen em-

ployed by the Queen in first constructing and improving the city of Babylon, indicate the almost unbounded authority of the times. That long line of statues that stood in Babylon, in Nineveh, in Thebes, in Memphis, in Athens, in Sparta, and in Rome, is but an index of the supposed importance of man. That the common herd went unlettered, and the favored few only drank at the fountain of knowledge, show the one-sidedness of the times. Man trusting in man and not in his God. But why do we not have all these things in modern times? Why, instead of those piles of architecture, do we now have cottage homes upon a thousand hillsides and broad valleys. Why have the walls of our western cities been left unbuilt? Why did the Mount Vernon society have to struggle so hard to raise means to erect a monument to Washington's memory? Why has there been such an outcry against slavery in these latter days?

It is because there has been an unseen hand put down with the grip of the paw of the Lion of the tribe of Judah, upon the galling manacles of ancient tyranny. God has broken the despotisms of the one-man power in the earth. He has, in a great measure, broken the confidence man has had in his fellowman as ruler, and has been rolling the stone, seen by Daniel, over the kingdoms of this world, and they are merging into the kingdom of our Lord and Savior.

We have thought that the tide of empire has been westward. In a sense it has, but in a higher and nobler, and a more permanent sense, the tide of empire has been rolling into the hands of the humble Nazarene. "And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne and the beasts and the elders: and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a loud voice, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honor, and glory, and blessing. And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honor, and glory, and power, be unto him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb forever and ever. And the four beasts said, Amen."

ART. VII.—*Why Did God Permit Sin?*

FULLY aware of the difficulties surrounding this question, and also of the various schemes that have been invented for the purpose of finding a satisfactory solution, I modestly, yet boldly, enter upon the consideration of this perplexing theme. It would be very interesting to notice many of the answers given to this question, and the reasons, assigned by various writers, for the existence of moral evil, but I must, for the present, content myself with only a small number. We are often told, "God permitted sin that he might overrule it to some good end." Sometimes we are told that he permitted it because it was necessary that he should have something which would be the opposite of moral goodness or holiness, that he might, by the contrast, show the subjects of his moral government the excellency of virtue, the beauty of holiness. Again, that "God permitted it for wise and holy purposes, but the reasons of which he has not seen fit to reveal to us."

Then again we are told that a sufficient answer is, "Even so, Father, for so it seemed good in thy sight." And we should not seek to be wise above what is written.

We are also taught, by a certain class of theologians, that he has decreed sin for wise and holy ends. "His effective decree respects all the good that comes to pass; his permissive decree respects the evil that is in sinful actions." (Shaw's Exposition of the Confession of Faith, page 61.)

Dr. Rice says: "Our doctrine then, concerning the first sin committed by man, and in which the human race is involved, is simply, that God, for wise reasons, decreed or purposed, first to permit, and, secondly, to overrule it for his glory." (God Sovereign and Man Free, page 31.)

Edwards ("On the Will," page 161,) says, "Sin may be an evil thing, and yet that there should be such a disposal and permission as that it should come to pass, may be a good thing." He also intimates that it is best that it should be.

He says, (on page 162) "I believe there is no person of good understanding, who will venture to say, he is certain that it is impossible it should be best, taking in the whole* compass and extent of existence, and all the consequences in the endless series of events, that there should be such a thing as moral evil in the world." What the author means by this passage is difficult to tell. It, like many others in the writings of this great man, is not at all transparent. What is to be understood by the "whole compass and extent of existence"? And what by "all the consequences in the endless series of events"? Does he mean that it is better that sin should exist than not to exist? or does he mean that it is better that such a constitution of things should be, and such beings exist as that there would be a possibility of sin, than not to have such a constitution of things, and the existence of such beings as are capable of sinning? If in the latter sense the passage is to be understood, I agree with him. In a certain sense, the present writer is an optimist, not, however, in the sense that "whatever happens, happens for the best." Nor, does he concur in the sentiment that "whatever is, is right," when applied to man and his deportment. Nor does he believe that "there is no evil," or that what seems to be evil is but a form of good, and is all a necessary part of one grand scheme, a stupendous, harmonious whole. But he believes, contrary to the teaching of some philosophers and divines, that the present order of the universe is the best possible. "That God has made the best possible universe; and by this I mean the holiest possible, and the happiest possible."

But Edwards further states (page 163), "God does not will sin as sin, or for the sake of anything evil, though it is his pleasure so to order things that, he permitting, sin will come to pass, for the sake of the great good that by his disposal shall be the consequence."

This passage evidently was intended to teach that God had something more to do with the introduction of moral evil into the universe than simply permitting it. He wills and so orders things that sin will come to pass for the great good that shall be the consequence. And he puts the matter in a

a still stronger light when he says (page 157), that God is the author of sin, not in the sense of "being the sinner, the agent or actor of sin, or the doer of a wicked thing." "But," says he, "if by the author of sin is meant the permitter or not hinderer of sin, and at the same time, a disposing of the state of events, in such a manner for wise, holy, and most excellent ends and purposes, that sin, if permitted or not hindered, will most certainly follow; I say, if this is all that is meant by being the author of sin, I do not deny that God is the author of sin. . . . And, I do not deny, that God's being the author of sin follows from what I have laid down." This, no doubt, is what is meant by Calvinistic divines, generally, when treating upon this subject—that God is, in some sense, the author of sin. This is evidently the meaning of the Westminster Confession of Faith, when it says, "God did freely and unchangeably ordain whatsoever comes to pass, yet so as thereby neither is God the author of sin." That is, God has decreed sin, but not so decreed it as to be the author of it as an agent, or doer of the deed. Still by all that class of divines, the existence of sin seems to be considered a necessary thing, and even a good thing.

Dr. Hodge, in "Theology," vol. 1, (page 435) says, "Assentient creatures are necessary for the manifestation of God's benevolence, so there could be no manifestation of his mercy without misery, or of his grace and justice if there were no sin.

. . . Sin, therefore, according to the Scriptures, is permitted that the justice of God may be known in its punishment, and grace in its forgiveness. And the universe, without the knowledge of these attributes, would be like the earth without the light of the sun." Again he says, "Sin in itself is an evil; relatively it is good. The universe is better with it than it would be without. . . . Thus, if sin be the necessary means of the greatest good, it ceases to be an evil, on the whole, and it is perfectly consistent with the benevolence of God to permit its occurrence." (pages 432-3.) With such views of sin, it is no matter of surprise that men look upon it as a light thing, scarcely worth serious consideration, and are ever ready to apologize for it in them-

selves and in others. If in itself an evil, yet relatively good, and if the universe is better with it than without it, why may men not sin with impunity? and especially so, if sin exists because God decreed or purposed to bring it to pass? Why not do evil that good may come? Now, I prefer saying that God has not in any sense decreed sin, and, perhaps, it would be better to say that he has not even permitted it.

When we are told, as we often are, that the existence of moral evil is a great mystery which we can never solve, and one which we should not seek to understand, but one that exists for wise, good, and holy purposes, we cannot avoid the reflection that such teachers are very inconsistent in giving, as they are wont to do, so many reasons for its existence. And against this procedure I am constrained by the existing facts, to enter my earnest and solemn protest against their philosophy and against their reasons. On this point I quote Rev. Alexander Stewart, Aberdeen, Scotland. In his very able work, "The Westminster Confession of Faith Tested," he says: (page 64), "If it is said that God has unchangeably decreed all the sins of men, the bold assertion 'that God is not thereby the author of sin,' unsupported as it is by any proof, will never satisfy thinking minds. We must descend to the awfully horrid blasphemy of saying that God is the author of sin, or we must abandon the doctrine that he has planned in eternity, and made unchangeably certain for time, all the myriad acts of wickedness which are committed. There is no middle ground that can be maintained—no milder views of the decrees can be taken. For, according to the decretal system, God did not ordain, because he saw that free agents would resolve on the things he decreed, but God had to plan and fix the whole future before he could know what would be done in it. There is no escape, therefore, from the conclusion that all wickedness was devised and then made certain by God. He must have decreed the evil, and all agents to be wicked that were to be instrumental in carrying it out, according to the eternal and divine plan."

That it may be seen that I do not misrepresent the teachings of their system, I quote from Shaw's Exposition again,

(page 58), "That God must have decreed all future things is a conclusion which necessarily flows from his foreknowledge, independence, and immutability. The foreknowledge of God will necessarily infer a decree, for God could not foreknow that things would be, unless he had decreed they should be, and that, because that things would not be future, unless he had decreed they should be." The last sentence is from Edwards' *Miscellaneous Observations* (page 114).

Again, (page 60): "He has not decreed anything because he foresaw it as future, and the execution of his decrees is not suspended upon any condition which may or may not be performed. This is the explicit doctrine of our Confession." This, no doubt, is a true version.

I consider it a great mistake in theological writers to confound the decrees and foreknowledge of God, as they often do, or to make his foreknowledge depend upon his decrees; that he could not, with certainty, foreknow anything, if he had not decreed it. How could he decree a thing which he did not know? How could he make certain any future event which he did not foreknow? Hence concerning the sins of mankind—the introduction of moral evil—I believe he foreknew it as certain, because he foresaw that man, exercising the freedom of his will, would produce such a result. The event may have been as certain as if he had decreed it, but not as necessary.

If I foreknew,
Foreknowledge had no influence on their fault,
Which had no less proved certain, unforeknown.

In the discussion of this subject, from whatever standpoint it has been viewed, it has ever been the prevailing method to proceed upon the gratuitous assumption that God has really and truly permitted sin. It seems never to have entered the minds of most writers on this subject, that this is the very thing to be proved. We should not take it for granted that because a moral agent has, in the exercise of his own volition, performed a particular act, it is *ipso facto*, an evidence that it was permitted. "It is sometimes said that God permitted sin. I do not like the expression. It is true that he did not prevent it, but he permitted it, if he permitted it at

all, in the sense in which a righteous and just ruler permits adultery, theft, murder, and other crimes. He knows they will occur, they grow up out of the very constitution of man. He does not place a garrison in every house to prevent them, still I do not say that he permits them. I know he does not approve their existence. Neither would I say that God permits sin." (Beard's Lectures, Vol. III, page 508.)

We do not like the expression nor the idea that it conveys, and will not use it, believing that it encourages false doctrine and erroneous practices. And when we are asked the question, "Why did God permit sin?" our answer is, "Did he?" We do not like the answers given by the Necessitarian, the Calvinist, whether moderate or hyper; nor those of the Optimist who asserts that evil is good, that whatever is, is right. Hence I submit this: That God has not permitted the existence of sin or moral evil.

Had this position been assumed and maintained in theological discussions from the first till now, how far in advance of the present attainments in morality and holiness the world might have been to-day. This done, the Church, in her conflict with sin, would not present to the outside world, the unenviable attitude of an apologist.

The moral system of the universe, like that of the material, is one of harmony and order—formed and designed for this end. Sin is disharmony, disorder, ruin. Sin is, but ought not to be. Sin is *ἀνομία*—lawlessness, an unjust and wicked intrusion into the rightful domain of the Sovereign Ruler of the universe.

It is not of God, but against God. It is *ἀνομία*—a transgression of the law, which like its Divine Author, is just, holy, pure. It is the very thing that God most solemnly prohibited—interdicted by his authority—by the most terrible sanctions. It is difficult—indeed impossible—to perceive how, under existing circumstances, he can, in any proper sense, be said to have permitted sin.

To permit, is to grant permission, liberty, or leave, to allow, to suffer, to tolerate, to empower, to license, to authorize. (Worcester.)

Webster says, To grant express license or leave to do; to give leave of; to allow. Synonyms, To allow, let, grant, admit, suffer, tolerate, endure, consent to. To permit, allow, suffer. To permit is more positive, denoting a decided assent, either directly or by implication.

Now, in what sense has God permitted sin? Certainly not in the sense of granting license, or giving leave to, for this is the very thing he did not do, but he did the very opposite of what is generally claimed in the premises. There was no license either directly or impliedly given to the first man, nor to any man to do wrong.

And if I were not disposed to pursue the question further, I might pause here and demand of the advocates of the various theories held for accounting for the existence of moral evil, that they show some Scriptural authority for maintaining that God has permitted sin. But when we do this, we are told that this is purely a psychological question, a question concerning mental phenomena.

We simply reply that we are not concerned as to what ground shall be occupied, whether metaphysical or scriptural, only do not let the Maker be involved in the matter in any responsible sense. For, wherever sin is seen, its tendencies are toward death and destruction. We may ever exclaim, as we look upon its ravages, "An enemy hath done this."

And God is evermore protesting that this is not his work: it was not essential to the perfection of his plan of government. His warning, entreating voice is ever heard in the heart and conscience of every sinner, "O do not this abominable thing which I hate."

But it is objected that sin exists, that God did not prevent it, and therefore he must have permitted it. This implies that he might have prevented it if he had chosen to do so; but his will and choice were that it should exist, and hence it is asserted he permitted it for the greatest good. Now, if he might have prevented it, and yet chose to permit it, is he not, in some responsible sense, the author of it?

If he permitted it when he could as easily have prevented it, is there not good reason to suspect that he prefers sin to

holiness? that there is something which he esteems above holiness, or moral virtue and purity, and that that something is sin—moral evil?

And here I may be allowed to suggest, as a solution of this whole question, that sin exists not by Divine choice, will, or decree, not by God's permission, but by the voluntary abuse and perversion of moral power and freedom given to man for a better purpose—that of loving, obeying, and serving his Creator. This I maintain is sufficient reason. There is no need of another. There is no necessity for the ever-recurring perplexing question as to the origin of moral evil. There is just as much propriety in a man's saying that he lets it rain, as there is in saying that God permits sin, and as much truth-funess. If it was not an object of his power to prevent it, he cannot be said to have permitted it. And this was the case. This brings us to observe:

That the existence of sin was not, *ex parte Dei*, a preventable thing in moral government. Moral government implies a moral governor, and moral subjects to be governed. The affairs of such a government must be administered by adequate means—means adapted to the end—that is, moral means. Such a government implies moral freedom—self-determining power in the subjects to be governed. Such was the government under which man was placed at his creation. Such were the attributes belonging to him as a subject of government. It is generally conceded even by the rigid Calvinist, that man must be a free agent, if he is accountable for his actions. They may differ as to what that freedom is. It may be well for us to consider briefly, What is a moral agent?

Doctor Dwight says: "By the term moral agent, I wish it to be understood that I intend a real agent, a being whose thoughts, affections, and actions, are his own. If man is an agent, then there is no necessity of tracing his actions beyond himself." (Ser. 8, *et alibi.*)

Edwards says: "A moral agent is a being that is capable of those actions that have a moral quality, and which can properly be denominated good or evil, in a moral sense, virtuous or vicious, commendable or faulty. To moral agency belongs

a moral faculty, or sense of moral good and evil." (On the Will, p. 19.)

Bledsoe, in his "Examination of Edwards on the Will," (p. 217,) says: "This, then, is the true idea of a free-agent: It is one who, in view of circumstances, both external and internal, can act without being efficiently caused to do so. This is the idea of a free-agent which God has realized, by the creation of the soul of man."

Doctor Whedon, in his extensive and elaborate work on "The Freedom of the Will," (p. 398,) says: "If guilt, or responsibility, or obligation, be a reality, the power of counter-choice is a reality. Responsibility, therefore, demonstrates free-will."

Mahan says: "All moral government, all laws, human and divine, have their basis in the doctrine of liberty; and are the perfection of tyranny, on any other supposition. To place creatures in circumstances which necessitate a given course of conduct, and render every other course impossible, and then to require of them, under the heaviest sanctions, a different and opposite course—what is tyranny if this is not?" (On the Will, p. 42.)

These quotations, from authors of different schools of philosophy and theology, show clearly enough what is considered a moral agent, and what is necessary to moral accountability. We might multiply quotations of this character, from various authors at hand, all bearing on this point, but the above are sufficient for our present purpose.

Does man possess these characteristics of a moral agent? Did he have those elements of freedom at the beginning of his responsible existence? If so, how could his Creator prevent his sin? Having determined upon a moral government, and having created man with such a constitution—a subject of moral government—how could he have prevented the results which followed? To have controlled his volition, and thus prevented choice, would have been contrary to the principles of his government. "Liberty implies the possibility of evil. That being who, in the presence of law, would not be able to execute it, nor violate it, to obey nor disobey it, would not be

a free being. A free being is of nature capable of evil." (Problem of Evil, p. 132.)

The origin of evil, then, must be looked for in the acts of created will. Sin is the wrong act of a free agent, whose acts are not necessitated. The mind despises force. It cannot be coerced to the choice and practice of virtuous actions; hence, the existence of sin is not, as many suppose, an inexplicable mystery. It is a mystery how man could dare to be guilty of it, and responsible for its existence. How it came to be is not the mystery, but that it should be at all. Some who hold the theory that God permitted sin for some good end, though he could have prevented it, console themselves with the thought that it will not forever be triumphant against him; as if the whole mystery of iniquity were contained in the words forever. The astounding fact which confounds all philosophy and all religion, too, so far as religion is a thing of man's reason, is that it should exist at all. And when we are told that God is a being who is infinitely wise, holy, and powerful, and therefore if sin should be forever triumphant against him, it would present the strange absurdity of something existing which is superior to the infinite and all-powerful. But will God become more wise, holy, or powerful in the future than he is now? than he has always been? Must sin be diminished to make room for the expansion of his perfections? Does the infinity of his perfections ebb and flow with every increase and diminution in the sum of human guilt and misery? Against this immovable barrier of the existence of sin, the waves of philosophy have dashed themselves unceasingly since the birth-day of human thought, and have retired broken and powerless, without displacing the minutest fragment of the stubborn rock, without softening one feature of its dark and rugged surface. Sin will continue to propagate itself throughout the endless ages as an unmitigated evil.

We may be told that evil is a privation, or a negation, or a partial aspect of universal good, or some other equally unmeaning abstraction; still all the while our own hearts bear testimony to its fearful reality; to its direct antagonism to every

possible form of good. (See this thought further developed in "Limits of Religious Thought," by Mansel.)

Now, so far from its being a preventable thing in moral government, we unhesitatingly affirm that God has done all he could to prevent sin's entrance and existence. And if the objection be urged that this limits his omnipotence, we answer that it is not a question of power; that it was not an object of divine power, or of his physical omnipotence, to prevent sin. His power is omnipotent only in the line of its own action and within its own sphere. We do not limit the divine power when we say that he cannot make two and two equal to five, for it is not an object of his power to do that; it does not come within the sphere of his omnipotence. Nor when we say, he cannot work contradictions, cannot perform inconsistencies, cannot lie, cannot become mortal. So, we see that it is not derogatory to his character; that it does not detract from any of his attributes; does not limit his power, to say that there are some things that even omnipotence cannot do. Must we say that God permitted sin, when he could just as easily have prevented it, or if permitted be too strong a term, say that he did not prevent it when he had the power to do so; and all this to vindicate his character as a being of omnipotence?

We shall better vindicate his character by endeavoring to ascertain what is truth, and what is God's true relation to sin. We should not so fear to limit the power of God in his relation to sin, as that we shall thereby have him implicated in its existence. But is he not limited? God is limited. He is limited forever and ever; and yet he is omnipotent. And if you ask me how? I say, he is limited by the impossible. He cannot make man God. He cannot make the universe divine.

"Doctor Hodge says: 'Any May morning he could roll forth forty worlds freighted with higher happiness; and by the word of his power, he could have kept iniquity out of his sight, and banished it forever from his creation.' But he can say that to-morrow and to-morrow; can stand on the verge of space, and when the universe is as near infinite as he

can possibly conceive, he can cry out forty more and forty more. There is no limit to this appeal. But there is a limit to the possibility. And here is precisely our argument. The universe is of its very nature finite. This implies an end. This implies that God must set it. Suppose he wished it the best possible, it would certainly deny his omnipotence if he could not have it; and yet if he had it, it must be finite. God could ordain the boundary, and one boundary would be wise and another foolish; and this is all we declare. God has made the best possible universe; and by this we mean the holiest possible, and the happiest possible for the vast creation." (Fetich in Theology, by John Miller, Princeton, N. J., p. 151. A scathing critique on Doctor Hodge's Theology, by a man of the same school.)

I conceive it to be a grave error in theology, or in philosophy, to consider God the only efficient cause. This error, I imagine, arises from want of distinguishing between the sphere of the moral government, and that of the physical. Starting out with the fundamental error, men are wont to consider that all that is, is of God, and is his way, and must be vindicated as such. Hence, they look upon sin and wrong as the best thing possible—and God's relation to sin that of a proponent—that it was a part of his plan. Sin, thus presented and consecrated as the Divine method of the universe, places God in such a strange contrariety in his relations to it, that our intelligence cannot appreciate it, and our moral sense utterly repudiates it as a method and relation worthy of a God. God is the first cause, but not the only cause. "Much that he has made has in its nature as really the element of cause as he is himself. All intelligence is cause, inherently and necessarily so, and cannot be otherwise. All that God has made 'in his own image and after his likeness,' is like him in this respect, and, in its sphere, is as properly cause as he is in his. God's relations to the conduct and character of finite, created intelligence, in an economy of moral government, must be arranged on other principles than that he is the only efficient cause." (The Problem Solved, p. 44.)

It should ever be borne in mind, that the fact of moral

government being assumed, we must look elsewhere for the evil than to the will of God as the only efficient cause; and we think this goes far toward solving the mystery. The problem of the existence of evil, is not so dark as the thing itself—sin. For it there can be no good and justifiable reason. Sin is intrinsically wrong. It is an infraction of God's righteous law, an invasion of his rights, a resisting of his will, and is, and can be, of right, nowhere.

"There is a class of theologists who reject every explication of the origin of evil, on the ground that they limit the Divine sovereignty, and to the question why evil is permitted, they reply, 'We cannot tell.' If God can, as they insist he can, easily cause holiness to shine forth with unclouded and universal splendor, no wonder they cannot tell why he does not do so. If, by a single glance of his eye, he can make hell itself clear up and shine out into a heaven, and fix the eternal glories of the moral universe upon an immovable foundation, no wonder they can see no reason why he refuses to do so. The only wonder is that they cannot see that on this principle, there is no reason at all for such a refusal, and the permission of moral evil. For if God can do this, and yet permits sin 'to raise its hideous head in his dominions,' then there is, and must be, something which he loves more than holiness, or abhors more than sin. Hence, the reason why they cannot tell is, in our humble opinion, because they have already told too much—more than they know." (Bledsoe's Theodicy, p. 215.)

I would take the shorter, safer method, and instead of trying to show why God permitted sin, would say that he has not permitted it in any proper sense of that term, and further, that it was not, and is not, a preventable thing in moral government. Whatever would, on God's part, prevent it, would prevent all good; would destroy the very foundation of moral government, and reduce mind to the condition of the material, and place all government under the control of physical omnipotence.

God could no more have prevented the introduction of moral evil into the universe, under the existing constitution of things, than he can now, by the exercise of his will or the

exertion of his power, cause universal holiness and consequent happiness, to take the place of the sin and wretchedness now existing. God could not have prevented sin, but man could, and he ought to have done it. There was no way by which God could have done it, but by refusing to create such beings as he did. Should it be asked, Why then did he create them? we answer, Because he saw that more honor and glory would accrue to his character by creating them, and more happiness to his creatures, even with the possibility or certainty of sin, than if he had created them otherwise than he did.

Cui bono? Does some one say that? Much every way; great advantage.

First, We shall, by assuming this position, exonerate the Sovereign Ruler from the charge of any complicity with the sinfulness of mankind; that he may not only be clear, but so appear when he judges. We may also here discover that there is a wonderful significance in the ministry God proposes for it. "Jesus Christ is not the remedy of sin, and his atonement is not an apology for sin. There is nothing in the measure of atonement that is designed or calculated to favor sin, or to extenuate its enormity, but to oppose, to destroy, and to prevent it. The atonement is a demonstration to the universe, that there never was, in the eternal mind, a decree accessory to evil; for everything in its provisions is purposed, and designed, and fitted to suppress all sin. God, indeed, foresaw that evil would intrude into the universe, and he made provisions against its entrance; but his mind and counsels are quite guiltless of it. To vindicate his decrees from any suspicion of any shade of evil, he has, at an infinite expense, shown how repugnant sin was to their order and character, by publicly condemning it in the person of his own Son." (Jenkyn on Atonement, p. 98.)

Second, This being assumed, it will show to sinful man the terrible, fearful, weighty responsibility resting upon him as a moral agent, and how great his guilt in rejecting "God's remedy for sin," and assuming the dreadful and eternal consequences of a life of sin and rebellion against God. Upon this principle we shall have no difficulty in showing the crim-

inality of unbelief, and that the sin and doom of incorrigible offenders were not the result of the Divine decrees, nor of his will, as the efficient cause, but the legitimate and necessary consequence of that almost omnipotent *will-not* of their own hearts. This would give unwonted power and efficiency to the gospel, when brought home to the heart and conscience of the sinner, causing him to feel that this sin is his own, that he is the guilty party, and that God was not, in his sin, nor in the first, nor in any other, *particeps criminis*.

ART. VIII.—*American Sunday School Work.*

(NO. II.)

THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL (SIXTH NATIONAL) CONVENTION.

THE article in the October number of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM for 1875, on the subject of which the present article is a continuation, presented many facts which we deem of permanent interest to the Christian Church. That article did not propose a history of Sunday-schools, but it offered some general views of the rise and progress of the Sunday-school cause in America; especially in the United States. The account of the development of co-operative action on the part of devoted workers, was brought down to the close of the Fifth National Sunday-school Convention, held in Indianapolis, Indiana, in April, 1872. In more than one of the National Conventions, there were present representative men from foreign lands, whose devotion to the cause of Sunday-schools led them to seek fellowship with kindred workers in our great country. In recognition of this significant and suggestive fact, the proposition was made, and enthusiastically carried, in the Indianapolis Convention, to call the next general gathering of the friends of this noble institution an *International* Convention, and thus wipe out all boundaries between the lovers of so world-wide an interest as that which

is specifically instituted and maintained for the one purpose of bringing the children of all lands to the one Saviour of all men. An Executive Committee, composed of prominent workers, with Rev. H. C. Trumbull, of Connecticut, as Chairman, was appointed to make all necessary provision for the meeting of the grand assemblage, three years from that time, and the responsibility was placed upon that Committee to arrange for the exact date of the meeting, the place where it should be held, the programme of its exercises, and the appointment of the leading speakers on the topics which should engage the attention of the body. The Committee labored with energy, wisdom, and perseverance, and the result was a gathering of the representatives of the great Sunday-school cause, which was more thoroughly expressive of the grandeur of its character and purposes, and of the beauty and breadth of its spirit, than had ever before assembled.

The First International Convention met, by due appointment and call, in the city of Baltimore, Maryland, at 10 o'clock, A. M., on Tuesday, May 11, 1875, and continued its sessions, morning, afternoon, and evening, until Thursday night following. Sitting amidst the vast body of delegates from so many States and Provinces, and in full sympathy with the glorious spirit of the occasion, and with its noble mission, we rejoiced to be permitted to see as an accomplished fact, that the blessed Sunday-school movement, so small and so obscure in its beginnings, had expanded from the unit of strong conviction and piety in individual minds and hearts, into congregational co-operation, then into local organizations of different congregations, embracing a village, town, city, country, or larger district, reaching in its progressive advance the dignity of State Conventions, widening and rising in its flow until it attained the breadth and volume of National Conventions, and, finally, appearing, in its august majesty of sweep, in an International Convention, spreading beyond all limitations of governmental lines and sectarian divisions, as the representative of the spiritual interests and organizations of the Sunday-schools of the continent and of the world.

When the convention was first called to order, the Chairman of the Executive Committee "nominated the President and Secretary of the last convention as officers *pro tempore* of this, which was approved." P. G. Gillett, LL.D., of Illinois, President of the Indianapolis Convention, then took the chair, and after devotional exercises were had, made a very spirited and pleasing address, from which the following is an extract:

"BRETHREN AND FRIENDS: The Fifth National Sunday-school Convention of the United States of America, held in the city of Indianapolis, having renewed the provision of the fourth convention, that its sessions should occur triennially, adjourned *sine die* on the 19th of April, 1872, subject to the call of the Executive Committee, as to the place and exact time of the assembling of this, the Sixth National Sunday-school Convention. The last session of the convention also provided that our neighbors and brethren of the Dominion of Canada, should be invited to unite with us in the present convention, and thus make this the First International Sunday-school Convention of the United States and British America. . . . The time of our assembling is auspicious, and the place very appropriate to the time. Just entering upon the centennial year of the great republic, which we would fain have endure a cycle of ages; just preparing to live over the transactions of our fathers of a hundred years ago, . . . upon what ground could we, as laborers in the Lord's vineyard, coming together as the descendants of the heroic Huguenot settlers of the sunny South, and of the resolute pilgrims who landed on 'stern New England's rock-bound coast,' when 'the woods against a stormy sky their giant branches tossed'; upon what ground, I say, could we, with more eminent propriety assemble, than in this State and city founded by Lord Baltimore, who, living in an intolerant age, first proclaimed to the world a commonwealth upon this Western Continent, one of whose cornerstones should be full religious toleration? Here we may fitly welcome among us, as a constituent element of this convention, our brethren from the Dominion of Canada. . . . The observance of our Centennial would be incomplete with-

out a recognition of the agency of the Sunday-school, in conserving to society those religious principles which constitute the basis of civil liberty and secure its perpetuity. He whom we are accustomed to speak of as 'first in war, first in peace, and first in the hearts of his countrymen,' and to denominate 'the father of his country,' in his farewell address said, 'In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, public opinion should be enlightened'; and an illustrious old Genoese writer has tersely said, 'Without a speculative and a practical acquaintance with the religion of Christ, it is impossible to form a good citizen or a pure republic'. . . . In the two great nations represented in this Convention, the real monarch is public opinion. This is

A weapon that comes down as still
As snow flakes fall upon the sod;
And executes the freeman's will,
As lightning does the will of God.

The development of this continent in population and growth of material resources, has been unparalleled in the history of the world. To meet the moral and religious emergencies of this magnificent growth, special instrumentalities, untried in the previous experience of mankind, were required. The providence that bestowed the one, conferred the others as he did Christianity itself, when the fulness of time had come and men were ready for them. Prominent among these instrumentalities was the Sabbath-school, conducted by men and women who knew not how wisely they planned or how well they wrought. Though almost a hundred years old, the Sunday-school is not yet adequately appreciated either in the Church or by society. For half a century the Sunday-school missionary has been in the cabin of the pioneer on the frontier of civilization. The first rude school-houses he has consecrated to Bible study, and has rallied the young and the old to the cross of Christ. The seed thus sown has germinated and grown, has budded and matured into Christian churches, Christian communities, and Christian States.

In the interest of this beneficent institution, and in the

spirit of our Master when he said 'Suffer little children to come unto me and forbid them not,' we are assembled to-day. We are here from the mountain and the valleys; from the Pacific slope and the Atlantic coast; from the lakes of the North and the gulf of the South; from the pineries and the sugar-plantations; from the din of the factory and the plough of the prairie; from the marts of commerce and the rural home. We are here in the name of our divine Master, who has said, 'go ye therefore and teach all nations.' In his name we here and now set up again our banners, sustained by more than a million prayers of those whom we represent.

The soldier in battle feels safe only when he has confidence in the man at his side. We have come hither that we may feel the touch of the elbow, and receive again the spirit of consecration and adoption from above, and with renewed vigor return to the fields of labor in which God mercifully honors us with a place.

Within the last year we have seen more than sixty thousand dollars expended in fruitless efforts to return to his home in Philadelphia, a child who had been cruelly abducted. Where is the individual so craven-hearted as to say that the expenditure was unreasonable, though fruitless! The whole land has awaited with breathless interest the endeavors to recover the lost child; but ours, brethren, is a labor not to restore a single boy to father and mother and home, but to bring back the thousands and millions of Charlie Rosses throughout the world who have wandered from our Father's house above, and for whose redemption our elder Brother has given his life."

In the person of Rev. J. E. Grammer, D.D., one of her devoted pastors, Baltimore then extended to the Convention a most cordial and beautiful welcome, in a speech rich with golden utterances, which we would be pleased to give entire, but cannot. We insert a couple of short extracts. Speaking of the purpose for which the Convention had met, he said :

"We see assembled in this Convention the representatives of the North and the South, of the East and the West of our own beloved land; and we hail our brethren from the

sister States of Canada and from the mother country, the Queen of the Nations. Forgetting national distinctions, we come here to realize and declare that we are fellow-citizens with the saints and of the household of God. We own a bond stronger than that of sectional interest and more enduring than the association of States. While the flags of our country are dear to our hearts, we must prize still more that standard which floats from the cross, and which has been given to us as the banner to be displayed because of the truth. It is cheering to see so many minds guided by one faith, so many hearts throbbing with one sentiment, so many lives consecrated to a common end. Is there any tie so strong as that of religion? The poet has said:

'States fall; arts fade;
But Nature doth not die.'

Even with more truth it may be said of the sacred sympathies which unite us, All else may fail, and the busy pursuits and engrossing cares of life share in the common lot of temporal things, but the Bible will endure forever. The Gospel will never become obsolete. The work of the Sunday-school will be more enduring than brass or marble."

Impressing the thought that the moulding power of the Sunday-school is mighty for good, he declared with emphasis:

"*Youth is the time to begin.* The feelings are impressible, and may be shaped like the ductile wax and the plastic clay. It was Baxter's famous aphorism that if Christian teachers did their duty, conversion in adult life would be the exception and not the rule. But if it were not so, the impressions made by the Sunday-school teacher are never lost.

'Character groweth day by day, and all things aid it in unfolding;
And the bent unto good or evil may be given in the hours of infancy.
Scratch the green rind of the sapling, or wantonly twist it in the soil:
The scarred and crooked oak will tell of thee for centuries to come.
Even so mayest thou guide the mind to good or lead it to the
marrings of evil.'

—*Tupper.*

In adult life how difficult it is to influence the opinions or change the habits. It is like trying to twist the gnarled oak, or mould the thoughts and principles which will shape its

whole life. The stream which trickles from the mountain top, if directed by the hand of wisdom, will become the agent to turn a thousand mills and wheels of industry. Childhood is as that stream: as you train it will be the future."

Responses on the part of the Convention were made in brief but suitable terms by J. Bennett Tyler, Esq., of Philadelphia, and Rev. W. S. Blackstock, of Ontario, Canada. Just as their speeches closed a telegram was received and read to the convention:

To Chairman Sunday-School Convention, Baltimore, Md:

"Church of England Sunday-school Teachers, now meeting in Exeter Hall, London, send Christian greeting and best wishes for success in our common work."

J. PALMER."

The following response to this telegram was sent by the Chairman of the Executive Committee:

"We cordially reciprocate your greetings. May the cable through which we speak, symbolize our unity as Christian workers, as it fulfills the prophecy, "There shall be no more sea."

The report of the Executive Committee was a brief but suggestive document. One striking paragraph is presented here because of its spiritual and historical bearings:

"No difficulty was experienced in securing representative men from the South to co-operate with the Committee in its plans, and eight new members were added accordingly. A visit made to the South by the Chairman and Secretary of the Committee, for the purpose of inducing such co-operation, developed only the warmest spirit of fraternal sympathy between the workers in a common cause, North and South. The result, by God's blessing, is this new Convention, more thoroughly national, so far as the United States is concerned, than any of its predecessors, and made international by the attendance of a strong delegation from the various Provinces of the Dominion of Canada."

A nominating committee, composed of one delegate from each State and Province represented, of which Rev. J. B.

Mitchell, D.D., of Missouri, was a member, reported a list of permanent officers of the Convention, with Rev. G. A. Peltz, of New Jersey, as President, one Vice President from each State and Province, and five Secretaries, of whom the Rev. A. Andrews of Ontario, Mr. E. C. Chapin, of Iowa, and Rev. M. B. DeWitt, of Tennessee, were present, and they prepared the records of the body, which have since been published in an elegant pamphlet, under the editorial supervision of Prof. W. F. Sherwin, of New Jersey. The nominations were unanimously accepted. Among the Vice Presidents who did not make their appearance in the Convention, although they were delegates, there were some of the most distinguished men of their particular denominations, such as Rev. Drs. J. L. M. Curry, of Virginia, J. L. Girardeau, of South Carolina, and Hon. John B. Gordon, of Georgia, United States Senator.

The President made a brief speech on taking his position. It was to the point, and among other good things, he said :

"There are two points we must keep in mind as we go on in this assembly. First, the promotion of the most perfect and loving Christian brotherhood. We should not merely use this precious opportunity to look at each other, and to hear each other, but to grasp each other's hand, and make each other's acquaintance ; and therefore I make the first act of my presidency of this body the appointment of every member of the Convention a committee to introduce himself to everybody else. Now it is customary to give a Convention the privilege of voting on the appointment of committees. If it be your pleasure that such a Committee of Introduction be appointed, say aye ! [An overwhelming vote.]

My second point is this: Let us proceed with the unwavering desire to have the blessing of God upon all that we do. [Amen!] Not merely in our own strength, not merely in our own wisdom, not merely with human power let us counsel together here, but clinging to the Lord, leaning on the Lord, and thus we shall have his benediction resting upon us all the way through."

A call was made for reports of the condition of the Sunday-school work in all the States and Provinces, and, as far as

possible to ascertain, in countries beyond the sea. The roll of States was called, and some delegate previously agreed upon by the State delegation, made a succinct statement, giving the general features of the work done and to be done. This aroused a deep interest and showed a wonderful movement all over the world in bringing the children in contact with God's precious truth as the source of real enlightenment and the means of salvation. The general impression made upon the attentive mind, from all that was stated, was that the Church of Christ was probably never before so thoroughly aroused to the vast responsibility of leading the young to the cross of our crucified Lord.

It is well here to record the facts connected with the numerical strength, spiritual character and general aspect of this great convention. The Committee on Credentials, on making its final report, presented the fact that four hundred and sixty-three delegates were properly entitled to seats in the body. These represented twenty-seven States of our Union, the District of Columbia and three Provinces of Canada. The actual constituency of the convention will be made known when we come to consider the report of the Statistical Secretary. By comparison with the history of former conventions, as seen in our preceding article on this subject, it will be readily perceived that this convention had the highest claim of any to be called truly national in breadth. The basis of representation was that of two delegates for each of the members of the United States Congress, that is, of both the Senate and the House of Representatives; so that if a certain State had fifteen Senators and Representatives in Congress, the Sunday-school people of that State would be entitled to thirty delegates in the convention. In the Newark and Indianapolis Conventions, there were comparatively few delegates from the Southern States, whereas there were at Baltimore eighty-three actually present from ten States and thoroughly enlisted in the work, a number of whom was honored with positions of relative importance and responsibility, while quite a number of others were absent who had been duly appointed and expected to attend. As the Executive Committee stated in its report to the convention, faithful

efforts had been made by its members to secure co-operation on the part of the workers in Sunday-school in the Southern States, and cordial responses had been made from every direction. One significant illustration is presented in the delegation from Tennessee. At Indianapolis, there were three delegates from this State, all told, whereas at Baltimore there were fourteen, with several absent whose appointment had been made and who were expecting to attend. Several Southern States had good delegations at Baltimore that had not a delegate at Newark or Indianapolis. These facts show the progress of fraternal feelings throughout our great country during a few years after the fearful scenes of civil war, and they exhibit the growth of interest in the great and blessed subject of Sunday-school work and its methods, scope, and objects.

One of the most pleasing features of the spirit of this Convention, which was seen from beginning to end, was its devotional earnestness as manifested in frequent prayers, songs, Scripture readings, and words of exhortation. The prayers were pregnant with that hearty trust and soul-yearning which proves a blessing to all who enter into true worship; the songs were full of the joy of praise and expressive of the strength of a great and beneficent purpose; the Scripture readings were selections of peculiarly moving and stimulating passages of God's word; and the words of exhortation came in the course of long speeches, in short speeches, in incidental remarks, in all manner of forms. Some of the grandest "tones" of the Church were sung with rousing effect and many of the sweetest notes of our Sunday-school music were rung out upon the air by a thousand voices and hearts. Spirituality was the atmosphere in which the body seemed to breathe, and its impartation of living power gave a glow of joy to every soul, and fervid enthusiasm to every movement of the occasion. There was profound interest in the themes of discussion, and refreshing variety in the nature of the exercises. Never have we seen an assembly of such enthusiastic workers in one large body. Those three days were a season of rare privilege for personal enjoyment and of rich opportunity for doing and receiving good. There

were so many real thinkers together that he who could move them would ultimately influence a multitude of other thinkers and workers, and thus a wave of indefinite volume would be started whose final results could only be measured by the eye of Him who sees at once all possible boundaries of mental and spiritual power.

The general programme of subjects arranged by the Executive Committee for the three days, was full of interest. After what has already been presented as to the exercises, the report of the International Lesson Committee, by the Rev. Warren Randolph, D.D., Secretary of the Committee, was read on the evening of the first day, and speeches delivered in connection with it, by the Rev. John Hall, D.D., of New York, and B. F. Jacobs, of Chicago. It would be pleasant and profitable to introduce the committee's report in full, but we must be content with a considerable extract of much historical and spiritual value:

"In common with the general Christian public, the committee have marked with amazement and delight the far-reaching influence of our work. In the plans it formed three years ago, the Indianapolis Convention was acting more wisely than it knew. It inaugurated a system of Bible study more general and more thorough than the world has ever seen before. The committee to whom was assigned the selection of the lessons, and who, in this respect, are only the servants of the Christian public, did not then, nor do they now, grasp the magnitude of the work. When they see the favor with which it has been received, they unite with you in giving devoutest thanks to God for the honor which, through this agency, he has put upon his Word, and for the blessed fellowship into which he is thereby bringing his people.

The committee have found their personal communings, while engaged in their work, among the most delightful experiences of life. On these occasions they have found the voice of prayer and the song of praise stirring their profoundest Christian sensibilities, and blending their souls in the sweetest Christian fellowship. They have found an earnest of the day when the watchmen 'shall see eye to eye'—when

they 'shall lift up the voice; with the voice together sing;'—when it shall be seen that the Episcopalian and the Baptist, the Congregationalist, the Presbyterian, and the Methodist, are all 'one in Christ.'

The extent to which our work is already carried, far surpasses the most sanguine expectations. These lessons are largely in use throughout our own land by Methodists, Presbyterians, Baptists, Episcopalians, Congregationalists, Lutherans, Moravians, friendly members of the Reformed Churches, Adventists, and many others,—a mighty host, to be enumerated only by millions. Each of these denominations has established Sunday-school periodicals, large parts of which are devoted to the exposition of the lessons. In addition to these, private enterprise has established many more. The weekly religious press, of almost all denominations, in every issue expounds the same, and in some instances secular papers are doing it, while the teaching of the lesson for the following day has become the Saturday feature of the noon-day prayer-meeting all over the land. Thus our lessons have found their way to the Sunday-schools along the shores of the Atlantic, down the slopes of the Pacific, and through all the region which lies between. East and West and North and South have come to love and use them. Who would have thought, ten years ago, that Divine Providence was preparing for our land such a bond of union! 'This is the Lord's doing; it is marvelous in our eyes.' Scarcely less wonderful is it that the British colony of Canada should be so heartily in accord with us.

On the 19th of April, 1872, the day when this committee was appointed, there were just three years wanting of a hundred since our fathers broke out in open revolt from the British crown, striking on that day the first blow for our independent nationality at Concord and Lexington. But the mother-country has joined us almost as cordially as her colony. Mr. Gladstone, by his letter to the Lexington centennial, amazed the world with the evidence he gave of the progress of good feeling. Nothing will do so much to make universally prevalent the sentiments he expressed, and to unify the English-speaking people, as a united study of the Bible. But

this is not all. Our work will help to unify the nations. The tidal wave is already rolling along the shores of continental Europe. The grand swell is felt in Asia, and even in the regions that are beyond.

Our lessons are to-day in use in France and Germany, in Sweden, Norway, Denmark, the Netherlands, Switzerland, Turkey, Italy, and Greece; in Syria, Hindustan, India, Burmah, and China. Mexico and the Choctaw Indians are sitting with us to study the same scriptures. The Isles, too, wait for God's law. Australia, New Zealand, and the Sandwich Islands have clasped hands with us across the intervening waters, and it is literally true that one set of Sabbath studies is going with the sun around the globe."

Dr. Hall's speech was probably the most striking, most pleasing and refreshing address of the whole occasion, and from it we must take a passage or two. Let it be remembered that the platform on which the Doctor stood, occupied by the President, Vice-Presidents, and Secretaries, was decorated with the American and British flags, and with a representation of the globe, on which was a cross in evergreen, etc. The learned and devout speaker said:

"I feel inclined, in the beginning of the few remarks I have to make, to say nothing so much as this: 'Glory be to the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost'—to the Father of lights, who has given us this Bible; to the incarnate Son, who is its substance; and to the holy, quickening Spirit, who gives it life and power! God has led his people to put honor upon his Word, and so to give honor to him, and he has honored them who have honored him, and his blessing has given the success of which we make joyful mention here, and for which devoutly and unitedly we render thanks to him.

There has been great blessing upon this work. If we look at it in its international aspects, as uniting the great branches of the English speaking race, it has been a blessing. This flag on my left hand (turning to the British flag) is of interest to me through many memories and associations; and this on my right hand (turning to the American flag) is of interest to me through admiration and love and gratitude; but

they are both bound together in my thought by that which is in the midst (a large cross of evergreen, studded with flowers, upon a background on which were the words in illuminated letters, 'God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of Jesus Christ our Lord,') which is the common possession of Great Britain and the United States, and the knowledge of which constitutes the grandest charm and mightiest element of power to both the one and the other."

Some very significant thoughts are found in this passage also :

"Personally, I have myself derived great advantage from the study and the teaching of the lessons. I would not venture to intrude self into this matter if it were not meant to serve a public purpose in this connection. It is known to a number here that for some years now, it has been my pleasant duty to give such notes as I was able, upon the lesson for the National Sunday-school Union. Many times when I had done the best I could to present these lessons in a simple, logical, intelligible form, I have felt that I could get no better sermon to preach to my people than the sermon that I have thus made myself master of. There are some here who will not take it as a mistake when I say that the people to whom I minister, before I came among them, were people as solidly instructed in religious truth as any in the United States. They have sat under the ministry of Dr. Romeyn, and Dr. James W. Alexander, and Dr. Nathan Rice; and I do not disclose improperly the secrets of the study when I say that some of the sermons that have secured the best attention, and, I think, have been productive of the best results, have been the substance of what I have been giving as notes for the instruction of the teachers, and helps for the children in these Sunday-school lessons. And I tell you why. When we have put the truth in its simplest forms, and in the logical arrangement in which it is most easy to understand it, and particularly to remember it; and when we have brought it down to the very level of the child, then it is just the truth that fits the men and women on the average in our congregations; many of whom have need of nothing more than this, that they may be made as little children, that they may

receive the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ. My brethren, we talk about making the Bible interesting. Let us allow the Bible to speak for itself, and it will make itself interesting. We wreath the sword of the Spirit in such flowers as we can gather, and we dull its edge. Let us fling the flowers away and let the sharp sword cut, and it will cut its way to the attention, the interest, the conscience, the heart of the people; and it wounds that it may heal, it smites that it may bind up and restore.

I know it would be an easy thing to say that you cannot possibly get a common lesson that will suit all classes and conditions of the pupils in a school. A good brother in Philadelphia once asked this memorable question on this matter: 'Did you ever see a good leg of mutton from which a hungry man could get a good satisfactory dinner, and yet that would not admit of being boiled down to a broth that would refresh and strengthen a sickly child?"

Mr. B. F. Jacobs, to whom is given much of the honor of securing the adoption of the International Series of Lessons, made a plain but forcible speech upon this subject.

On the second day of the Convention, after a deeply interesting devotional meeting, the forenoon was occupied with the very important question, "How to secure pupils from the unevangelized masses," the discussion being opened by Rev. W. T. Wylie, of Pennsylvania, in a well considered and strongly expressed speech. Among other good thoughts are these:

"Individual work must bring in the unevangelized masses. The church must go down to bring in these untrained persons, and put them under the influence of the gospel. . . . The Church has two things to do—to seek for the conversion and Christian culture of every human soul brought within its reach. There is work for the minister, but there is work for the member also. When men are brought to Christ, they are to be instructed in Christian life and trained in Christian work, and so we expect to bring the pupils in. What methods should be adopted? Two. First, personal effort. It is not for a Christian man to give his money and his time on the Sabbath day only. I believe that he should

make his business every day to reach some one not acquainted with Jesus Christ personally. Besides this personal effort, regardless of the church, there ought to be proper organized effort—a church home prepared for every one who lives within the reach of a Christian community, and I think the time has passed away when Christian men will give millions of money for the accommodation of a few, while multitudes are perishing for the Bread of Life. An example is set us in the city of Brooklyn, where, at a cost of twenty dollars for an individual, accommodations are furnished for four thousand six hundred people, gathered there to hear the gospel, instead of other churches where three to five hundred dollars are spent, in order to furnish seating room for one individual. What matter does it make what the building is, so that we hear the story?"

Many practical suggestions were offered upon the topic, which cannot be quoted here.

The afternoon session was introduced by religious exercises, and then Rev. H. M. Parsons, of Massachusetts, opened the discussion on "How can we secure more pupils from the Church." The address was long and experimental in character, exhibiting the speaker's views from a practical standpoint. He gave an impressive account of the manner in which he brought about great results in a congregation by means of direct investigations of God's word, on the afternoon of the Sabbath-day, when he assembled the people, old and young, who entered with Bible in hand into the searching of the Scriptures. The plan worked so well that it aroused a general and permanent religious interest, in the individual and collective life of the congregation.

The evening session of the second day's work considered the inquiry, "How to secure more efficient co-operation with the home," led in an excellent address by the Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., of New York. The Rev. Dr. Means, of Georgia, was to open the discussion, but he did not reach the Convention at all, owing to illness.

At the proper hour on the morning of the third day of the Convention, the question, "How to secure for children the fullest advantages of the sanctuary services, and of the social

meetings of the Church," was discussed, according to previous appointment, by the editor of the THEOLOGICAL MEDIUM. We shall not quote from the address to illustrate the speaker's views; but may, without offense we trust, state that he held that simplicity, religious fervor, true faith, common sense, and the real gospel, must be in the preaching, praying, singing, and then will the children be drawn to and kept in the public service of the congregation, and in the meetings for social prayer.

The next topic for discussion, which was the last general subject before the body, was, "How to increase the teaching power of the Sunday-school." For some time past there has been, and there is still, a wide-spread interest in this theme in the mind of the Sunday-school public. Men of all denominations have been giving it close attention, and endeavoring to develop satisfactory and permanent results in methods of teaching, and in qualifications of teachers. Many conferences have been held, and various suggestions made in regard to all branches of the subject, and some of the leading publishing establishments have arrived at some general conclusions, which were presented to the convention by Rev. J. H. Vincent, D.D., Sunday-school Secretary of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in opening the discussion on the theme. His views were sound and well stated. His principal points, which were forcibly delivered, and expanded at sufficient length, are as follows, with which we also present a condensed statement of "a general course of study" for teachers, which he placed before the Convention in printed form:

1st. The Sunday-school teacher is a teacher of Christian truth. 2nd. He should himself be a Christian. 3rd. The Sunday-school teacher being a Christian, will have a spiritual discernment of the truth. 4th. The Christian teacher must acquire a knowledge of the truth he would teach. 5th. The Christian teacher must understand the true theory and the correct methods of truth-teaching. 6th. The Christian teacher must therefore receive, as far as practicable, a preparatory training for his work.

The last was the point of emphasis, in connection with the fourth and fifth points, and the speaker declared that the

precise manner of arriving at the result was of little moment, so that the thing was done. He then said:

“The following course of study has been approved by official representatives of the Sunday-school work, in connection with the American Sunday-school Union, and the Sunday-school departments of the Baptist, the Methodist Episcopal, and the Presbyterian Churches:

COURSE OF STUDY.

I. *The Bible*—1. Evidences of its Divine Origin; 2. The Classification and Design of its Several Books.

II. *Interpretation of the Bible*—1. Rules of Interpretation; 2. Helps to Interpretation; 3. Types and Symbols; 4. Difficulties in Scripture, and How to Treat Them.

III. *Contents of the Bible*—1. History and Chronology; 2. Geography; 3. Manners and Customs; 4. Religious Appointments; 5. Doctrines.

IV. *How to Teach the Bible*—1. The Place and Purpose of the Sunday-school; 2. The Organization and Management of the Sunday-school; 3. The Sunday-school Teacher's Office—its Sacredness and Power; 4. How to Study a Sunday-school Lesson; 5. How to Teach a Lesson; 6. How to Win and Hold Attention; 7. Methods of Illustrating and Questioning; 8. Common Mistakes in Teaching; 9. Reviews; 10. Week-day work of the Sunday-school; 11. Jesus, the Model Teacher; 12. The Holy Spirit, the Sunday-school Teacher's Guide and Helper.

V. *Topics for Special Lectures before the Class, or for Essays or Conversations by the Class*—1. Home and the Sunday-school; 2. Preaching and Teaching in New Testament Times; 3. The Story of our English Bible; 4. False Religions Mentioned in the Bible; 5. Natural History of the Bible; 6. The Link Between the Old and New Testaments; 7. The Church in the Early Centuries of the Christian Era; 8. Modern Discoveries in Bible Lands; 9. Children and Youth at the Church Service; 10. How to Develop the Spirit of Benevolence; 11. Memory—Its Use and Abuse; 12. Unconscious Influence; 13. The Sunday-school Teacher's Reward.

The “forms in which the training class for Sunday-school teachers may exist,” were then suggested to be:

“1. *The Teachers' Meeting*, where the best methods of teaching may be illustrated in connection with the lesson for the ensuing Sabbath, and some time be spent in the study of general subjects on which Bible teachers need instruction. I believe that teachers don't want, at these meetings, so much of the subject matter as how to teach the lesson. 2. *The Normal Class*, held on a separate evening, for a series of weeks or months, during which a prescribed course of study

may be prosecuted. Ten evenings, or twelve lessons. 3. *The Preparatory Normal Class*, held at the same hour as the Sunday-school, composed of older pupils who are to be teachers in the future, and taught by the most competent person who can be secured for the purpose. 4. *The Seminary Normal Class*, in connection with institutions of learning. Two hours a week may be spent in exercises adapted to give our young students an idea of the dignity and importance of the Sunday-school work, and to prepare them for useful service there. This will apply also to our theological seminaries, where our theological students are prepared to go thoroughly into the Sunday-school work. The most interesting classes I have had have been in connection with theological seminaries. I know of colleges in this country, where the students have taken a course of training, and the Sunday before the Commencement received their diplomas as graduates of the normal class, and graduate the Thursday after from the institution itself. 5. *The Special Normal Class Exercises*, in connection with Sunday-school Conventions, Institutes, etc."

Mr. Ralph Wells, of New York, made a very earnest speech on this subject, after Dr. Vincent.

It was manifest to the observing mind that this great question was the culminating point of interest and importance before the Convention. In fact, it is one of permanent moment to the future Church of Christ in the world. The breadth, length, depth, and height of the subject cannot be measured even by those who are most profoundly engaged in promoting the expansion of the idea of the Sunday-school in its grandest conception. We pronounce our benediction upon the blessed work, and commend it to the most loving care of the Father of lights, because our hope for the conversion and Christian instruction of the world lies very largely in the efficiency and spiritual power of this honored instrumentality of the Church. We appeal to our earnest workers throughout the Cumberlaud Presbyterian Church to give their most serious attention to the points proposed in the question discussed by Dr. Vincent before the Baltimore International Sunday-school Convention, and let there be concert of action in

schools and judicatures of the denomination in furtherance of inquiry and in promotion of best effort in this direction. Wise and concerted effort to this end will repay itself a thousand fold.

During the progress of the Convention, various intermediate exercises were had, such as free conferences of workers, illustrative meetings of infant-class teachers conducted by Mrs. S. W. Clark, meetings of State delegations for making acquaintance and interchange of fraternal feelings, etc. An Executive committee was appointed from various denominations and States to provide for the next International Convention as to exact time, place, themes, speakers, etc. An important statement of facts was made by O. C. Morse, of New York, concerning Sunday-school work on the Continent of Europe, showing that within a few years past considerable growth has taken place in the views of Christian men, and in results of work. In Germany, Austria, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, France, Norway and Sweden, many schools have been established with thousands of teachers, and tens of thousands of scholars, but the results yet are very small in comparison with the work to be done. The following is a gloomy picture, "The Hungarian-speaking population numbers, I believe, between six and eight millions, and are almost absolutely destitute of any religious literature whatever." What a comment upon the influence of the Roman Catholic Church!

A pleasant state of feeling was produced when J. N. Robson, Esq., of *South Carolina*, invited the next Convention to meet in Charleston, and the Rev. H. M. Parsons, of *Massachusetts*, seconded the motion. An incident of interest occurred when J. W. Weir, of Pennsylvania, was introduced and spoke to the Convention, stating, among other things, that he was a member of the "First National Convention," which met in New York in 1832, no other being present. The old man seemed full of devotion to the blessed work of the Sunday-school.

A most instructive and valuable address was made by Rev. H. A. Smeltz, Superintendent of the Maryland Sunday-school Union, who appeared before the Convention by special

request, and gave the method of working which had dotted the State of Maryland all over with Sunday-schools, and made the city of Baltimore alive with the zeal of busy toilers for Jesus. He exhibited colored maps of the city and State showing the position of every Sunday-school in both, and then he made this remarkable statement: "We can lay our hands on every child in this city, and hence when it is wanted to get up a mission school, the pastor comes to the rooms (of the Superintendent, etc.,) and inquires where a good place is, and we can tell him every spot of destitution in Baltimore. He then goes to this spot and Bro. Baker (city missionary), gathers two or three hundred of these children for a school, and, in two or three weeks, it is running all right." Mr. S.'s speech made a deep impression because it was not *theory* but *history*, not how he thought it ought to be done, but how it had been done gloriously. We left Baltimore with the clear impression that Maryland stands first of all the States in completeness of system and effectiveness of Sunday-school work, Connecticut, New Jersey, and Illinois standing close by.

Mr. Smeltz said that five or seven thousand dollars a year was easily raised to carry on the operations of the Maryland Sunday-school Union, and that two thousand children had been reported as converted and united to the churches in the city alone, and six thousand seven hundred in the State, in 1874. More children are connected with Sunday-schools in Baltimore than attend its public schools, it was said.

STATISTICS.—Mr. E. P. Porter, of Chicago, Illinois, the Statistical Secretary of the Convention, appointed at the Indianapolis meeting, made a report of statistics which showed a grand advance in the movement of the noble cause. He stated that he had twenty-six reports from twenty-eight States in which there are organizations of workers into county, district, and State conventions, and twenty-two other reports from States and Territories not organized on the general plan of union among all the denominations. We wish we could present in full the tabulated statistical statement of the Secretary, but we can insert here only the sums total for the United States and Canada, viz.: In the United States, number of schools, 69,871; number of offi-

cers and teachers, 753,060; number of scholars, 5,790,683; total Sunday-school membership, 6,543,708. In Canada, number of schools, 4,401; number of officers and teachers, 35,745; number of scholars, 271,381; total Sunday-school membership, 307,126,—grand total of Sunday-school membership reported in the United States and Canada, 6,850,834. The report represented the far away land of Alaska as having twenty-seven Sunday-schools, Oregon and Washington Territory, one hundred and twenty-five, Arizona four, Dakota forty-eight, Idaho six, Montana twenty-eight, Nevada sixty-seven, New Mexico thirty-eight, Utah eighteen, and Wyoming four. Pennsylvania has more schools than any other State, seven thousand six hundred and sixty; New York next, six thousand; then Illinois, five thousand nine hundred and sixty-seven; then Ohio, five thousand five hundred and forty-five; then Indiana, three thousand one hundred and sixty-one; then Missouri, two thousand eight hundred and thirty-four, being the largest number in any Southern State. Tennessee has more schools than any other Southern State east of the Mississippi river, two thousand four hundred and fifty-one; but Virginia has more scholars, Kentucky next, etc. New York has more scholars than any other State, seven hundred and twenty-nine thousand; Pennsylvania next, seven hundred and nine thousand eight hundred and forty-five; Illinois next, four hundred and twenty-five thousand seven hundred and ten, etc. The statistics must have been imperfectly reported for Texas, as only three hundred and twenty schools appear to its credit, but the same may be said of other States. We trust that by the time the next Convention assembles, there will be a much more complete report for our entire country, and much of the world beyond.

Although there had been a great crowd attending upon the Convention all the time, the throng was simply immense, on the last night, and full of enthusiasm. The singing was perfectly inspiring, and religious feeling general and joyful. Most pleasant speeches and many happy interchanges occurred, and a striking scene took place when the President introduced to the body the following eleven old workers as

having been fifty or more years in Sunday-school work: Amos Tappan, of Massachusetts, fifty-eight years; Aaron Coe, Rev. W. H. Pearne, P. A. Voorhees, of New Jersey, fifty-seven, fifty-two, fifty years, respectively; W. Woodward, Rev. T. B. Sargent, D.D., of Maryland, each fifty-six years; B. W. Chidlaw, of Ohio, fifty-five years; N. Kingsbury, J. W. Weir, of Pennsylvania, fifty-five, fifty-two years, respectively; Alden Baker, of Maine, and M. Hunter, of Illinois, each fifty-two years. W. Woodward was stated to have been for fifty years superintendent of the same school in Baltimore. B. F. Jacobs said much in few words at the close: "There are three things that we are to do: *Hold on to the Word of God, hold in objections, hold out to the end.*" President Peltz gave as the motto of the future for all the assembled workers,

BETTER WORK FOR JESUS.

The closing hymn sung to *Auld Lang Sync*, was that sweet one beginning

Hail sweetest, dearest tie that binds
Our glowing hearts in one,

and its notes resounded with thrilling power from probably two thousand voices. When the last prayer was offered and the benediction pronounced, there was a wonderful scene of hand-shaking and goodbys among brethren, in hope of meeting at last in heaven.

We have thus feebly endeavored to photograph this great and happy gathering of true, tried, and trusty followers of him who took little children up in his arms and "blessed them;" but we cannot impart the full spirit of the occasion by means of the pen. Dear reader, if you wish to realize it for yourself be sure to be there when the next International Convention meets. May the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with all who love the Sunday-school and who work for and in it! Amen!